DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 863 CE 000 076

AUTHOR Pourchot, Leonard L.
TITLE A Field Test Report of the Development of Instruments to Determine Peer Group Perceptions of the Sociological Status of Students Attending Area Vocational Centers.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE 28 Jun 73
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Area Vocational Schools; Evaluation Methods; Investigations; *Peer Acceptance; *Peer Groups; Peer Relationship; Program Planning; Questionnaires; Social Behavior; Social Factors; *Social Values; *Surveys; Vocational Directors; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to design, develop, field test, and recommend survey instruments and procedures for comparing the perception by their peers of the sociological status of vocational students both in area vocational centers and in high school vocational courses. Following a review of related literature, instruments were drafted, and three surveys were conducted. Input data concerning the instruments was gathered from professionals with expertise in vocational education, directors of area vocational centers, and high school students both involved and uninvolved in vocational training. This data was used to further develop the sociological testing instruments and procedures. These instruments were then used to determine evidence of peer groupings and sociological status. A conclusion was that sociological status does attach to different curricular groups. Therefore, planning officers and educators should be concerned with sociological viewpoints and their ramifications when planning future vocational centers. It was also suggested that the survey instruments be considered usable for obtaining future data on peer group perception. (KP)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO

From Jim Ellis
11/6/73

ED 080863

A FIELD TEST REPORT

of

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENTS TO DETERMINE PEER GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL STATUS OF STUDENTS ATTENDING AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Presented to
The State of Illinois
Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Springfield, Illinois

by
Leonard L. Pourchot
Project Director
June 28, 1973

CE 000 076

ED 080863

A FIELD TEST REPORT

of

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENTS TO DETERMINE PEER GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL STATUS OF STUDENTS ATTENDING AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS

Presented to
The State of Illinois
Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Springfield, Illinois

by
Leonard L. Pourchot
Project Director
June 28, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assistance of Mr. Robert Gray, Research Director, Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Mr. Harvey Bos, Director, Mid-Valley Area Vocational Center, Kaneland, Illinois, and Mr. Gunnar Fransen, Director of Vocational Education, Rockford, Illinois is gratefully acknowledged.

A special credit is due Dr. Joseph R. Ellis and Mr. Roger Nelson of Northern Illinois University who assisted so ably in the project and to Mrs. Marlena Drew whose clerical skills were of inestimable value.

Leonard L. Pourchot
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	LIST OF TABLES	ii
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT	
	Background and Rationale	1
	Problem and Purpose	1
	Basic Questions	2
	Method and Procedures	2
	Summary of the Review of Related Literature	3
II.	FIELD TEST RESULTS: STUDENT RESPONSES	
	Introduction	13
	Questionnaire Responses	14
	Semantic Differential Responses	15
	Interview Response Summary	37
	Summary	45
III.	FIELD TEST RESULTS: RECOMMENDED INSTRUMENTS	
	Introduction	49
	Instrument Assessment Results	49
	The Questionnaire	53
	The Semantic Differential	59
	The Interview Guide	65
	Summary	70
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
	APPENDICES	77
	A. Instrument Assessment Report (Jury Form)	78
	B. Instrument Assessment Report (Student Form)	79

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Integrated Sociological Factors.	7
II.	Identified Sociological Factors with Possible Relevance to Adolescent Peer Judgments and Sources of Their Identifications	12
III.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers (Questionnaire Response).	17
IV.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Take No Vocational Courses (Questionnaire Response)	18
V.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Take Vocational Courses But Do Not Attend An Area Vocational Center (Questionnaire Response)	19
VI.	Summary of Perceptions of Rockford Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers by Type of Student (Questionnaire Response). . . .	20
VII.	Summary of Perceptions of Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers by Type of Student (Questionnaire Response). . . .	22
VIII.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers (Semantic Differential Measurement).	24
IX.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Take No Vocational Courses (Semantic Differential Measurement)	27

Table		Page
X.	A Report and Comparison of Perceptions for Rockford and Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Take Vocational Courses But Do Not Attend An Area Vocational Center (Semantic Differential Measurement)	30
XI.	Summary of Perceptions of Rockford Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers by Type of Student (Semantic Differential Response)	33
XII.	Summary of Perceptions of Kaneland Area High School Students Concerning Sociological Characteristics of Their Peers Who Attend Area Vocational Centers by Type of Student (Semantic Differential Response)	35
XIII.	Interviewee Description.	38
XIV.	Composite Student Assessments of Three Instruments .	51

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

Background and Rationale

The State of Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education is charged by Federal legislation with the responsibility for conducting an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of vocational education programs, services and activities within the State; and for publishing and distributing the results of its evaluation. In order to discharge this responsibility, the Council contracted with Dr. Leonard Pourchot to conduct the Project reported herein.

Three premises provide the essential rationale for the need to develop and implement procedures and instruments for determining the perceptions of adolescents concerning the sociological status they ascribe to their peers:

A. Perceptions influence behavior.

B. Individuals assign social status to groups.

C. Peer groups exert a strong influence on values, choices, and behaviors of adolescents.

Problem and Purpose

Problem. What perceptions do three classifications of adolescent student peers report about the way they see and feel regarding the sociological status of area vocational center students in Illinois?

Purpose. The purpose of the study was to design, develop and field test and recommend survey instruments and procedures for determining the perception of the sociological status of area vocational center students as reported by area center students, non-area center vocational students and non-vocational students. Additionally, the study was addressed to the basic questions appearing below and has collected and presented data

from students in response to the problem stated above.

Basic Questions

A. Should planning of future area vocational centers be concerned with sociological viewpoints?

B. Are area vocational centers judged to be socially inferior to regular high schools?

C. Can usable data be obtained on actual perception of area center students by various peer groups?

D. Do perceptions differ on separate area centers as compared to additional facilities at existing high schools?

Method and Procedures

Method. The project adhered to a research and development approach. Following a review of related literature, instruments were drafted and three surveys were conducted to obtain input, criticisms and reactions from: (a) a jury of professionals with relevant expertise in vocational education and educational measurement; (b) directors of area vocational centers operating in Illinois; and (c) from high school juniors and seniors in districts served by the Rockford and Mid-Valley (Kaneland) Area Vocational Centers. Data from the surveys were used in the further development of the instruments and procedures recommended in Sections III and IV of this report. Additionally the data from the students provided the basis for the report of student responses presented in Section II.

Procedures. Following the development of advanced drafts of four instruments, based in part on input from a jury of specialists and directors of vocational centers, arrangements for conducting a student survey were completed with two area vocational centers and high schools

in the districts that they served. High school classes with students representing the target populations of the study (students attending area vocational centers, students taking no vocational courses and students taking vocational courses but not attending an area vocational center) were selected randomly for administration of three "paper and pencil" instruments. A sample of students from these classes was selected for a personal interview. In addition to responding to the instruments, students were asked to provide reactions and suggestions for improving the instrument. Each instrument required about ten minutes to administer. The data were collected in the latter part of May 1973. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Program was used in data analysis. The results of the student survey were presented with the revised recommended instruments as a report of data and also as an illustration of how the data obtained from these instruments could be analyzed and presented.

Summary of the Review of Related Literature

Introduction. Books, articles, and studies abound in these areas of our immediate interest. Following is a very brief overview of (1) the historical background of the present vocational-technical education programs, (2) commonly recognized sociological factors affecting status in our society, (3) adolescent peer group relations, and (4) views of perception.

In Table I some sociological factors are summarized and listed under the headings of "Scholastic Achievement," "Peer Group Relations," and "Socioeconomic Background." While the graphic presentation seems to separate these factors, there are interrelationships among them.

In Table II some sources of discussion on sociological factors are summarized. Prominent textbooks on the subjects of guidance, child and adolescent development, and sociological subjects are noted. A more complete

bibliography is found at the end of the report.

Historical Background. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided federal grants to states to develop vocational training programs and also directed states to file a state plan for vocational-technical education before they could receive the federal funds. A State Plan for the Administration of Vocational-Technical Education in Illinois was approved in September 1969.

Along with the federal funds, the Vocational Act established a National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education to help states plan, organize, and administer local programs. Scores of articles (Eddy, 1963; Law, 1964; Russo, 1965; Corplan Associates, 1966) were published by leading men in vocational education discussing the feasibility of vocational centers.

During the 1965-1966 fiscal years, 45 states were in the process of constructing, adding to, remodeling, or renovating buildings for these centers. Expenditures for construction during those two years amounted to $271 million. During the three-year period of 1965-1967, 689 construction projects were funded by the federal government (Evans, Mangum, and Pregan, 1969).

The National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education made recommendations which led directly to the passage of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments which provided additional funding for the state programs and for the first time allowed money to be spent for research. Projects were initiated across the country. Generalizations about personal and environmental influences were made about the youth and his orientation to work (Warren, 1967). Research evaluating vocational education programs was

done (Byram, 1968; Nerden, 1971). Cost effectiveness analyses of vocational-technical education programs were investigated (Kraft, 1969; Schriver, 1971).

However, a review of the literature indicates that there has not been extensive research exploring the sociological status of area vocational center students. With statistics (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1967) revealing that eighty percent of all youth enter the labor market without a college degree, there is a need to emphasize vocational education training. The planning of future area vocational centers should be concerned with sociological factors.

Sociological Factors. In determining sociological status, the first organized study of America's social class system was conducted in 1941 by Warner and his associates. But it wasn't until 1949 that Hollingshead's Elmtown Youth study analyzed the effect of the class system on teenage behavior.

During the past two decades, numerous writings (Havighurst and Neugarten, 1967; Stone and Church, 1968; Coleman, 1962) have indicated that differences in attitudes and behaviors exist among students of different class levels.

After extensive research, these levels were summarized by Havighurst and Neugarten (1967). The population distribution by social class is as follows:

Class	Percentage of Population
I -- upper upper II -- lower upper	1 - 3
III -- upper middle	7 - 12
IV -- lower middle	20 - 35
V -- upper lower	25 - 40
VI -- lower lower	15 - 25

It should be noted that the lines between the classes are not really clear cut, but in dealing with the public school student, Class I is not usually encountered.

Study after study has indicated that in American communities:

A. income and occupational strata consistently differ in behavior and attitudes,

B. different occupational positions are given different social evaluations,

C. awareness of stratification is highly variable but is universally important. (Cole and Hall, 1965; Havighurst and Neugarten, 1967)

Research has suggested some general findings dealing with the student's social class rank and his participation in school society (Shertzer and Stone, 1971). The following are some of these findings.

Youth from the upper class tend to fill leadership roles in school activities which the school usually designs for them. These youth usually gain leadership experience while students in lower class rank do not. School discipline is often adjusted to favor the upper class student. Students from the middle class usually work harder in the academic area than do other students, but middle class students still receive a disproportionate share of "A's" and "B's," while on the other hand the lower class students receive a disproportionate share of "D's" and "F's."

As investigations demonstrated that there were differences between students of different social class ranks, noted sociologists concerned themselves with the relationship of a student's sociological status and his ability to succeed. The status of a student can be determined through a number of

common denominators such as scholastic achievement, peer group relationships, and socioeconomic status. Data in TABLE I indicate the factors of each denominator.

TABLE I
Integrated Sociological Factors

Scholastic Achievement	Peer Group Relations	Socioeconomic Background
grades	manners	job of parents
successful completion of high school	popularity	community leadership of parents
intelligence	friendliness	education of parents
ambition	kindness	wealth/class
responsibility	leadership	house
language	reputation	neighborhood
	acitivities	

While it is possible to discuss each denominator separately, usually one factor of a denominator affects a factor of another denominator. It is best, therefore, to integrate all factors in the discussion.

In terms of scholastic achievement and socioeconomic background, early studies (Coleman, 1940) in the area of socioeconomic status (SES) concluded that there was no relationship between student achievement and SES. Even as late as the 1960's, some research (Curry, 1961; McDonald, 1964) still held that no relationship existed between the two factors. But the majority of recent literature has shown a significant relationship either between those two factors or a combination of factors.

Rosen (1956) concluded that achievement motives generally rise with social rank. An earlier study (Kahl, 1953) showed status to be twice as important as ability in achievement. Ability and sex combined with SES were

regarded as "basic" correlates in academic achievement according to Lavin (1956). A study in 1970 (Bushan) comparing SES to IQ in predicting GPA for 7 to 12 grade students concluded that while SES is a predictor of achievement, it is a better predictor when combined with IQ.

From the viewpoint of "like father...like son" ambitions, research (Empey, 1956; Forslund and Malry, 1970; Froiland, 1970) has revealed two important points:

1. students at the top of the socioeconomic hierarchy aspire toward more prestigious occupations than those toward the bottom.

2. the distance between the prestige of the father's occupation and that aspired to by his children increases as one moves down the socioeconomic hierarchy.

If students enrolled in area vocational centers are usually from the lower to middle class families as measured by the socioeconomic hierarchy, the second point is of major concern.

Studies (Kahl, 1953; Jensen and Kirchner, 1955) involving this class level have reported that mobility-blocked parents press their children's desire for education. The opportunity to choose a different vocation than one's father and thus move to a higher status in society is a major expectation in the American hierarchy of values for the low and middle class population as revealed in a U. S. Office of Education report (Brookover and Nasow, 1969).

Brookover (1967) reports that the education plans of a student are directly related to the student's academic performance and socioeconomic background. Von Stroh (1968) went on the report that the educational attainment of parents appeared to have an effect on whether or not their

children sought higher education in the vocational-technical area.

Similar observations were supported in the research done on rural/urban youth. Sociologists (Havighurst and Morgan, 1951) have reported that while class distinctions are relatively indistinct in rural areas as compared to cities, there is still a class hierarchy and students attempt to move up in social rank. This has been supported by a recent study (Farrier, 1969) demonstrating that rural students do stay or move up only one step higher on the social class rank than their parents.

In terms of academic failure of school dropouts, the lower social class student is more likely to fail than the upper or middle class student. Bernard (1963) suggested four fundamental courses for the high rate of dropouts among lower social classes:

1. lower class students do not participate in student activities and therefore are not an integral part of the school
2. lower class students cannot afford clothes, spending money, etc. necessary to gain peer approval
3. the hidden costs of school (books, yearbooks, class rings, activity fees, etc.) prevent them from feeling that they are part of the school
4. the cliquishness of students is a formidable barrier to becoming an enthusiastic participator in school life.

Over-all, studies indicate (Jersild, 1963; Shertzer and Stone, 1971) that dropouts tend to be less intelligent, less able academically, less well adjusted, less active, and from a poorer environment than those students who go on to complete their education. Dropouts feel that the schools have little to offer and have no way to satisfy their felt needs.

Another area influenced by a student's socioeconomic background is his ability to deal with verbal and written communication. Research

(McCandless and Evans, 1973) has reported that students from middle or upper social rank have more verbal, written and reading activity in their home environment than has a student of lower social economic background. This factor is also in direct relation to academic achievement or school failure.

It has also been suggested (McCandless and Evans, 1973) that students of different ethnic backgrounds, while communicating in their respective dialects, fail to use "grammatically correct" standard English and are therefore marked down for it by their teachers and are not accepted by students except those in their own ethnic group.

Peer Approval. In discussing the adolescent in relation to his peers, the most outstanding need of an adolescent is peer approval. Writers suggest (Garrison, 1965; Coleman, 1962; Powell, 1963) peer approval comes only by conforming to peer standards. Those standards will be different and unique unto each group.

While the student is conforming to the values of the group, it may be that he is losing his own self identity. This usually happens to adolescents who are constantly running with the "gang."

Some generalizations (Garrison, 1965) about the characteristics of individuals within peer groups can be made. High achievement by students is looked down upon by peers. Articles (Powell, 1963; Garrison, 1965) report that an appreciable discrepancy often exists between a student's IQ or academic achievement test score and his actual grades. When this occurs, the student is usually achieving in class at a level below his capability in order to avoid condemnation from his peers.

In the upper class peer groups students are usually intelligent, sociable, quiet, athletic, honest, kind, and cooperative. In the middle class peer groups, the students are usually intelligent, quiet, conscientious, fair, able to take a joke, athletic and honest. In the lower class peer groups, the students are usually sociable, fair, trustworthy, and mind their own business. All groups agreed in describing rejected peers as pesty, noisy, conceited and silly.

Perception. Extensive literature deals with the nature of perception (Journal, Association for the Study of Perception). Whether people perceive a real, existing object (or condition) or a representation (impression) is a much discussed issue. W. M. O'Neal discusses this problem from the standpoint of three theoretical approaches. The phenomenal field approach is succinctly outlined by Mouly in Psychology for Effective Teaching.

Two important premises of the phenomenological approach are (Mouly): A) Behavior is the product of one's perceptions, and B) Perceptions have to be related to the present structure, the pivotal point of which is the self. According to this theoretical construct of perception, the child behaves as he does because he sees the situation as he does.

Mouly identifies several writers who have given prominence to this theoretical approach. Among these are Combs and Snygg, Maslow, and Rogers.

Summary. The historical background of vocational education has been briefly outlined here. Factors in sociological status have been discussed and attention has been called to the importance of peer approval. In TABLE I appear sociological factors which can be identified in three categories, but which are also recognized as interrelated. In TABLE II

sociological factors which prominent authors have discussed in textbooks on the subjects of guidance, child and adolescent development, and social status are summarized (See TABLE II).

TABLE II
Identified Sociological Factors with Possible Relevance to Adolescent Peer Judgments and Sources of Their Identification

Psychologists → / Sociological Factors ↓	Shertzer	Jersild	Powell	Cole	Garrison	Stone	Coleman	Havighurst	McCandless
scholastic grades		x	x	x	x		x		
successfully completed high school		x	x	x	x		x		
ambition	x	x	x	x	x		x		
intelligence	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
manners	x	x	x	x	x		x		
responsibility	x		x	x	x		x		
friendly	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
popular	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
kind		x	x		x		x		
leader							x		
activities							x		
reputation with peers							x		
reputation with teachers							x		
use of poor grammar									x
occupation of parents	x	x	x	x	x			x	
community leadership of parents								x	
education of parents					x	x		x	
economic wealth	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
house								x	
neighborhood								x	

II. FIELD TEST RESULTS: STUDENT RESPONSES

Introduction

It was the intent of the project director to develop and field test instruments so their effectiveness could be ascertained, improvements suggested, and refinements made. The original drafts were modified and refined prior to field testing. Further improvements were expected as a result of the field experience. In this section of the report are the results of the field testing done with students in the Mid-Valley area Vocational Center and the feeder high schools of Kaneland and Batavia. The largest total number responding on any item was three hundred forty-nine, but not all students responded to each item on each instrument so totals in any one category may vary.

This section is organized in the following way: (1) Tabulations for the Questionnaire are presented and explained, (2) Tabulations for the Semantic Differential are presented and explained, (3) Interview responses are summarized, and (4) Finally, answers to the four basic questions are considered in light of the evidence gathered.

Questionnaire Responses

The student responses to the Group Characteristics Questionnaire are presented in TABLES III through VII. In the first three TABLES (III, IV and V) the responses of the entire sample of students from the Rockford and Kaneland areas are presented regarding each of the different groups of students: 1) Those students who attend area vocational centers (TABLE III); 2) Those students who take no vocational courses (TABLE IV); and 3) Those students who take vocational courses but do not attend an area vocational center (TABLE V).

These TABLES reveal that, in general, the students in the two areas did not differ on many items in the way they viewed their peer groups. In TABLE III, only answers to items three and ten were significantly different for the way Rockford and Kaneland area students viewed those who attend area vocational centers. In TABLE IV, answers to items ten, twelve, sixteen, and seventeen were significantly different for the views on students who take no vocational courses. In TABLE V items one, two and eleven were answered in significantly different ways.

While TABLES III, IV and V dealt with the differences in responses between the two geographically separated groups, TABLES VI and VII present data based upon the responses of the three different groups of students within each geographical area. Each group responded the way they viewed students who attend the area vocational center. In TABLE VI data reveal only one item (number three) which Rockford area students answered in a significantly different way. However, a departure from this pattern is presented in TABLE VII (Kaneland area) when eight out of eighteen answers were significantly different. An examination of each item which is

answered differently is required in order to see in what direction the difference runs. As a generality, one may hypothesize that expressed feelings on the Questionnaire in the Kaneland area schools indicate more of a feeling of difference among the types of students than is true in the Rockford area sample.

Semantic Differential Responses

The student responses to the Semantic Differential are presented in TABLES VIII through XII. In the first three TABLES (VIII, IX, and X) the responses of the entire sample of students from the Rockford and Kaneland areas are presented regarding each of the different groups of students: 1) Those students who attend area vocational centers (TABLE VIII), 2) Those students who take no vocational courses (TABLE IX), and 3) Those students who take vocational courses but do not attend an area vocational center (TABLE X).

Responses in TABLE VIII show ten items out of twenty-six were significantly different when Rockford and Kaneland area responses were compared. In TABLE IX only one response (Item two) was significantly different for the two geographical areas. In TABLE X only three responses (Items three, five, and nineteen) showed significant differences. Generalizing from these data is especially hazardous because significant differences may reveal quite different patterns of responses. For example, in TABLE VIII both Item one (popular-unpopular) and Item five (unintelligent -intelligent) show significance at the .05 level of confidence. In Item one larger percentages of Rockford responses were toward "unpopular" and in Item five larger percentages of Rockford responses were toward "intelligent." Care should be exercised in scrutinizing each item and the

percentage distributions before drawing a conclusion.

TABLES VIII, IX, and X dealt with the differences in responses between the two geographically separated groups. TABLES XI and XII present data based upon the responses of the three different groups of students within each geographical area. Each group responded to the way they viewed students who attended the area vocational center. In TABLE XI data reveal no responses of the twenty-six were significantly different. In TABLE XII, however, all responses were significantly different except for numbers nine and twenty-five. Again, as in the responses to the Questionnaire (TABLE VII) the Kaneland area responses indicate more of a feeling of difference among the types of students than is true of the Rockford area sample.

Grade and Sex Differences in Response.

On the Questionnaire, all grade levels and both sexes at both Rockford and Kaneland showed similarity in response on perceptions of area vocational center students. At Rockford the Semantic Differential showed significant differences by sex on five items. Girls had a high opinion of these students on items 16, 23, 24, and 26. Boys thought them "serious students." The Kaneland area girls favored these students in five areas which were significant (numbers 4, 7, 10, 16, and 24). All grade levels of Rockford students showed similarity in response, but at Kaneland responses on items 2, 4, 9, 11, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23 were significantly different. Generally, sophomores judged more favorably than did others.

TABLE III

A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS
(QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

Students who attend the area vocational center generally:	*	yes No.	yes %	sometimes: No.	sometimes: %	no: No.	no: %	X^2
1. ...live in the best neighborhood	R	2	2.8	50	70.4	19	26.8	N.S.
	K	1	0.6	89	57.8	63	40.9	
2. ...have wealthy parents	R	2	3.1	42	64.6	21	32.3	
	K	3	2.1	75	52.1	64	44.4	N.S.
3. ...do well in academic courses	R	24	29.3	48	58.5	10	12.2	
	K	16	9.4	121	70.8	34	19.9	.001
4. ...are not involved in school activities	R	15	18.1	47	56.6	21	25.3	
	K	16	9.4	99	58.2	55	32.4	N.S.
5. ...are popular and friendly	R	20	22.2	62	68.9	8	8.9	
	K	49	26.8	126	68.9	8	4.4	N.S.
6. ...are leaders at school	R	7	8.8	56	70	17	21.3	
	K	8	4.7	112	65.5	51	29.8	N.S.
7. ...probably will not be very successful when they finish high school	R	8	10.1	16	20.3	55	69.6	
	K	8	5.8	36	26.3	93	67.9	N.S.
8. ...probably will not complete high school	R	7	8.2	11	12.9	67	78.8	N.S.
	K	14	8.2	26	15.3	130	76.5	
9. ...do not mix well with most students	R	8	10.1	29	36.7	42	53.2	
	K	9	5.2	53	30.8	110	64	N.S.
10. ...are "looked down upon"	R	12	14.6	18	22	52	63.4	
	K	7	3.8	30	16.2	148	80	.01
11. ...have highly educated parents	R	6	9.4	44	68.8	14	21.9	
	K	6	4.6	96	73.8	28	21.5	N.S.
12. ...use poor grammar	R	6	7.4	42	51.9	33	40.7	
	K	14	8.1	92	53.2	67	38.7	N.S.
13. ...are the children of business and professional people	R	7	10.3	45	66.2	16	23.5	
	K	13	9.3	92	65.7	35	25.0	N.S.
14. ...are ambitious to become successful	R	39	44.8	44	50.6	4	4.6	
	K	57	33.7	103	60.9	9	5.3	N.S.
15. ...are not held in high regard by many of the teachers.	R	9	12.2	31	41.9	34	45.9	
	K	14	10.2	49	35.8	74	54.0	N.S.
16. ...probably will not go to college	R	31	39.7	27	34.6	20	25.6	
	K	69	45.4	59	38.8	24	15.8	N.S.
17. ...tend to be from minority groups	R	8	10.1	33	41.8	38	48.1	
	K	9	5.7	52	33.1	96	61.1	N.S.
18. ...will become adult leaders	R	7	10.8	47	72.3	11	16.9	
	K	11	8.9	89	72.4	23	18.7	N.S.

* R = Rockford Area
K = Kaneland Area

TABLE IV
A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO TAKE NO VOCATIONAL COURSES
(QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

These students generally:	*	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. ...live in the best neighborhood	R	6	7.7	61	78.2	11	14.1	
	K	16	10.1	104	65.4	39	24.5	N.S.
2. ...have wealthy parents	R	7	9.7	56	77.8	9	12.5	
	K	9	5.8	115	74.2	30	19.4	N.S.
3. ...do well in academic courses	R	20	22.7	64	72.7	4	4.5	
	K	43	25.0	115	69.9	14	8.1	N.S.
4. ...are not involved in school activities	R	8	9.5	46	54.8	30	35.7	
	K	11	6.5	83	48.8	76	44.7	N.S.
5. ...are popular and friendly	R	20	22.5	66	74.2	3	3.4	
	K	47	26.0	125	69.1	9	5.0	N.S.
6. ...are leaders at school	R	14	16.5	60	70.6	11	12.9	
	K	42	24.1	119	68.4	13	7.5	N.S.
7. ...probably will not be very successful when they finish high school	R	9	14.1	30	46.9	25	39.1	
	K	13	9.7	53	39.6	67	50.0	N.S.
8. ...probably will not complete high school	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	K	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. ...do not mix well with most students	R	9	11.1	39	48.1	33	40.7	
	K	18	10.3	72	41.1	85	48.6	N.S.
10. ...are "looked down upon"	R	8	9.3	27	31.4	51	59.3	
	K	3	1.6	48	26.2	132	72.1	.01
11. ...have highly educated parents	R	6	9.1	49	74.2	11	16.7	
	K	9	6.3	112	78.9	21	14.8	N.S.
12. ...use poor grammar	R	6	7.9	50	65.8	20	26.3	
	K	3	1.7	101	58.0	70	40.2	.05
13. ...are the children of business and professional people	R	8	10.5	50	65.8	18	23.7	
	K	14	10.4	99	73.3	22	16.3	N.S.
14. ...are ambitious to become successful	R	15	17.0	58	65.9	15	17.0	
	K	34	20.5	113	68.1	19	11.4	N.S.
15. ...are not held in high regard by many of the teachers.	R	10	13.3	35	46.7	29	38.7	
	K	11	7.1	61	39.4	83	53.5	N.S.
16. ...probably will not go to college	R	9	12.3	38	52.1	26	35.6	
	K	16	11.1	50	34.7	78	54.2	.05
17. ...tend to be from minority groups	R	11	15.3	33	45.8	28	38.9	
	K	7	4.5	57	36.8	91	58.7	.01
18. ...will become adult leaders	R	8	12.1	48	72.7	10	15.2	
	K	16	13.2	90	74.4	15	12.4	N.S.

* R = Rockford Area
K = Kaneland Area

TABLE V

A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO TAKE VOCATIONAL COURSES BUT DO NOT ATTEND AN AREA VOCATIONAL CENTER
(QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

These students generally:	*	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. ...live in the best neighborhood	R	7	9.5	55	74.3	12	16.2	
	K	4	2.5	117	74.5	36	22.9	.05
2. ...have wealthy parents	R	6	9.0	99	73.1	12	17.9	
	K	2	1.4	108	76.1	32	22.5	.05
3. ...do well in academic courses	R	16	18.8	58	68.2	11	12.9	
	K	17	9.9	125	73.1	29	17.0	N.S.
4. ...are not involved in school activities	R	14	17.5	48	60.0	18	22.5	
	K	20	11.6	98	57.0	54	31.4	N.S.
5. ...are popular and friendly	R	26	30.6	56	65.9	3	3.5	
	K	39	21.8	126	70.4	14	7.8	N.S.
6. ...are leaders at school	R	13	15.3	52	61.2	20	23.5	
	K	15	9.2	123	75.5	25	15.3	N.S.
7. ...probably will not be very successful when they finish high school	R	10	13.9	29	40.3	33	45.8	
	K	20	15.2	68	51.5	44	33.3	N.S.
8. ...probably will not complete high school	R	7	9.6	26	35.6	40	54.8	
	K	13	8.7	53	35.3	84	56.0	N.S.
9. ...do not mix well with most students	R	7	9.2	38	50.0	31	90.8	
	K	13	7.7	89	53.0	66	39.3	N.S.
10. ...are "looked down upon"	R	6	7.3	24	29.3	52	63.4	
	K	6	3.5	52	30.2	114	66.3	N.S.
11. ...have highly educated parents	R	7	10.3	53	77.9	8	11.8	
	K	4	2.8	107	75.4	31	21.8	.05
12. ...use poor grammar	R	6	7.6	46	58.2	27	34.2	
	K	9	5.2	108	62.4	56	32.4	N.S.
13. ...are the children of business and professional people	R	7	9.9	54	76.1	10	14.1	
	K	7	5.4	98	75.4	23	19.2	N.S.
14. ...are ambitious to become successful	R	26	32.5	46	59.5	8	10.0	
	K	37	21.8	119	70.0	14	8.2	N.S.
15. ...are not held in high regard by many of the teachers.	R	9	12.5	37	51.4	26	36.1	
	K	12	8.3	72	49.7	61	42.1	N.S.
16. ...probably will not go to college	R	17	23.0	35	47.3	22	39.7	
	K	37	26.2	68	48.2	36	25.5	N.S.
17. ...tend to be from minority groups	R	5	6.8	37	50.0	32	43.2	
	K	12	8.4	75	52.4	56	39.2	N.S.
18. ...will become adult leaders	R	7	10.6	50	75.8	9	13.6	
	K	3	2.4	103	81.7	20	15.9	N.S.

* R = Rockford Area
K = Kaneland Area

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF ROCKFORD AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

Students who attend the area vocational center generally:	*Type	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. live in the best neighborhood	1	0	0	25	80.6	6	19.4	
	2	0	0	6	60.0	4	40.0	
	3	2	6.7	19	63.3	9	30.0	NS
2. have wealthy parents	1	0	0	20	74.1	7	25.9	
	2	0	0	6	54.5	5	45.5	
	3	2	7.4	16	59.3	9	33.3	NS
3. do well in academic courses	1	6	18.8	21	65.6	5	15.6	
	2	3	23.1	6	46.2	4	30.8	
	3	15	40.5	21	56.8	1	2.7	.05
4. are not involved in school activities	1	4	12.1	24	72.7	5	15.2	
	2	4	28.6	5	35.7	5	35.7	
	3	7	19.4	18	50.0	11	30.6	NS
5. are popular and friendly	1	10	30.3	20	60.6	3	9.1	
	2	2	12.5	11	68.8	3	18.8	
	3	8	19.5	31	75.6	2	4.9	NS
6. are leaders at school	1	3	10.0	23	76.7	4	13.3	
	2	0	0	8	61.5	5	38.5	
	3	4	10.8	25	67.6	8	21.6	NS
7. probably will not be very successful when they finish high school	1	3	10.0	7	23.3	20	66.7	
	2	3	18.8	2	12.5	11	68.8	
	3	2	6.1	7	21.2	24	72.7	NS
8. probably will not complete high school	1	1	2.9	6	17.6	27	79.4	
	2	2	12.5	2	12.5	12	75.0	
	3	4	11.4	3	8.6	28	80.0	NS
9. do not mix well with most students	1	1	3.3	8	26.7	21	70.0	
	2	3	21.4	6	42.9	5	35.7	
	3	4	11.4	15	42.9	16	45.7	NS
10. are "looked down upon"	1	5	16.1	9	29.0	17	54.8	
	2	2	14.3	1	7.1	11	78.6	
	3	5	13.5	8	21.6	24	64.9	NS

(continued next page)

* Types: 1 = Students who attend Area Vocational Centers.
2 = Students who take no vocational courses.
3 = Students who take vocational courses but don't attend an Area Vocational Center.

TABLE VI (continued)
SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF ROCKFORD AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

Students who attend the area vocational center generally:	Type	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
11. have highly educated parents	1	2	8.0	18	72.0	5	20.0	
	2	1	10.0	5	50.0	4	40.0	
	3	3	10.3	21	72.4	5	17.2	NS
12. use poor grammar	1	1	3.2	16	51.6	14	45.2	
	2	2	14.3	5	35.7	7	50.0	
	3	3	8.3	21	58.3	12	33.3	NS
13. are the children of business and professional people	1	3	11.1	19	70.4	5	18.5	
	2	0	00.0	6	54.5	5	45.5	
	3	4	13.3	20	66.7	6	20.0	NS
14. are ambitious to become successful	1	19	57.6	14	42.4	0	0.0	
	2	5	35.7	7	50.0	2	14.3	
	3	15	37.5	23	57.5	2	5.0	NS
15. are not held in high regard by many of the teachers	1	5	17.2	11	37.9	13	44.8	
	2	1	7.1	6	42.9	7	50.0	
	3	3	9.1	14	45.2	14	45.2	NS
16. probably will not go to college	1	11	36.7	14	46.7	5	16.7	
	2	7	43.8	5	31.3	4	25.0	
	3	13	40.6	8	25.0	11	34.4	NS
17. tend to be from minority groups	1	2	6.9	13	44.8	14	48.3	
	2	2	15.4	4	30.8	7	53.8	
	3	4	10.8	16	43.2	17	45.2	NS
18. will become adult leaders	1	3	12.5	20	83.3	1	4.2	
	2	2	16.7	6	50.0	4	33.3	
	3	2	6.9	21	72.4	6	20.7	NS

* Types: 1 = Students who attend Area Vocational Centers.
2 = Students who take no vocational courses.
3 = Students who take vocational courses but don't attend an Area Vocational Center.

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

Students who attend the area vocational center generally:	Type	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. live in the best neighborhood	1	0	0	39	60.0	25	38.5	
	2	1	2.0	36	70.6	14	22.5	
	3	0	0.0	14	36.8	24	63.2	.05
2. have wealthy parents	1	1	1.7	36	60.0	21	35.0	
	2	1	2.1	23	38.9	23	48.9	
	3	1	2.7	16	43.2	20	54.1	N.S.
3. do well in academic courses	1	11	14.7	54	72.0	10	13.3	
	2	1	1.6	46	73.0	16	25.4	
	3	4	12.1	21	63.6	8	24.2	.05
4. are not involved in school activities	1	9	12.5	37	51.4	26	36.1	
	2	6	9.2	43	66.2	16	24.6	
	3	1	3.0	19	57.6	13	39.4	N.S.
5. are popular and friendly	1	28	35.4	48	60.8	3	3.8	
	2	16	23.9	46	68.7	5	7.5	
	3	5	13.5	32	86.5	0	0.0	.05
6. are leaders at school	1	5	6.9	55	76.4	12	16.7	
	2	2	3.2	38	61.3	22	35.5	
	3	1	2.7	19	51.4	17	45.9	.05
7. probably will not be very successful when they finish high school	1	5	8.2	16	26.2	40	65.6	
	2	1	2.0	16	31.4	34	66.7	
	3	2	8.0	4	16.0	19	76.0	N.S.
8. probably will not complete high school	1	12	16.0	13	17.3	50	66.7	
	2	1	1.7	11	18.3	48	80.0	
	3	1	2.9	2	5.7	32	91.4	.01
9. do not mix well with most students	1	7	9.2	23	30.3	46	60.5	
	2	2	3.3	21	34.4	38	62.3	
	3	0	0.0	9	25.7	26	74.3	N.S.
10. are "looked down upon"	1	1	1.3	15	19.7	60	78.9	
	2	6	8.5	12	16.9	53	74.6	
	3	0	0.0	3	7.9	35	92.1	.05

(continued next page)

* Types: 1 = Students who attend Area Vocational Centers.
2 = Students who take no vocational courses.
3 = Students who take vocational courses but don't attend an Area Vocational Center.

TABLE VII (continued)
SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE)

Students who attend the area vocational center generally:	Type	yes		sometimes		no		X^2
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
11. have highly educated parents	1	5	8.5	47	79.7	7	11.9	
	2	0	0.0	34	75.6	11	24.4	
	3	1	3.8	15	57.7	10	38.5	.05
12. use poor grammar	1	3	3.8	38	48.7	37	47.4	
	2	8	12.9	38	61.3	16	25.8	
	3	3	9.1	16	48.5	14	42.4	N.S.
13. are the children of business and professional people	1	8	12.9	44	71.0	10	16.1	
	2	3	6.4	31	66.0	13	27.7	
	3	2	6.5	17	54.8	12	38.7	N.S.
14. are ambitious to become successful	1	28	38.4	44	60.3	1	1.4	
	2	16	26.7	38	63.3	6	10.0	
	3	13	36.1	21	58.3	2	5.6	N.S.
15. are not held in high regard by many of the teachers	1	5	7.6	31	47.0	30	45.5	
	2	6	13.6	10	22.7	38	63.6	
	3	3	11.1	8	29.6	16	59.3	N.S.
16. probably will not go to college	1	21	32.3	31	47.7	13	20.0	
	2	40	67.8	14	23.7	5	8.5	
	3	8	28.6	14	50.0	6	21.4	.001
17. tend to be from minority groups	1	2	3.0	21	31.3	44	65.7	
	2	5	8.6	23	39.7	30	51.7	
	3	2	6.3	8	25.0	22	68.8	N.S.
18. will become adult leaders	1	7	13.2	39	73.6	7	13.2	
	2	1	2.3	30	68.2	13	29.5	
	3	3	11.5	20	76.9	3	11.5	N.S.

* Types: 1 = Students who attend Area Vocational Centers.
2 = Students who take no vocational courses.
3 = Students who take vocational courses but don't attend an Area Vocational Center.

TABLE VIII

A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS

(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

In general those students were perceived to be:

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. popular	*	ROCKFORD	4	3.5	33	28.7	62	53.9	14	12.2	2	1.7	unpopular
		KANELAND	4	2.5	81	51.6	60	38.2	11	7.0	1	0.6	
2. unfriendly		ROCKFORD	3	2.6	11	9.6	38	33.0	46	40.0	17	14.8	friendly
		KANELAND	8	5.1	12	7.6	44	28.0	72	45.9	21	13.4	
3. uninteresting		ROCKFORD	4	3.5	13	11.3	43	37.4	44	38.3	11	9.6	interesting
		KANELAND	6	3.8	21	13.3	52	32.9	62	39.2	17	10.8	
4. attractive		ROCKFORD	4	3.5	35	31.0	61	54.0	8	7.1	5	4.4	unattractive
		KANELAND	8	5.1	42	26.8	88	56.1	17	10.8	2	1.3	
5. unintelligent	*	ROCKFORD	3	2.6	12	10.4	35	30.4	51	44.3	14	12.2	intelligent
		KANELAND	2	1.3	33	21.2	55	35.3	60	38.5	6	3.8	
6. well groomed		ROCKFORD	11	9.6	48	41.7	42	36.5	12	10.4	2	1.7	unkempt
		KANELAND	8	5.1	54	34.6	60	38.5	31	19.9	3	1.9	
7. wealthy		ROCKFORD	2	1.8	18	15.9	81	71.7	11	9.7	1	0.9	poor
		KANELAND	3	1.9	27	17.2	104	66.2	21	13.4	2	1.3	

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE VIII(continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
8.	the out-group	ROCKFORD	4	3.5	19	16.5	65	56.5	24	20.9	3	2.6	
		KANELAND	8	5.1	18	11.5	87	55.4	38	24.2	6	3.8	the in-group
9.	troublesome students *	ROCKFORD	3	2.6	10	8.7	52	45.2	39	33.9	11	9.6	
		KANELAND	5	3.2	32	20.4	67	42.7	47	29.9	6	3.8	serious students
10.	smart *	ROCKFORD	7	6.1	41	36.0	59	51.8	5	4.4	2	1.8	
		KANELAND	10	6.4	54	34.4	64	40.8	26	16.6	3	1.9	dumb
11.	from the best neighborhood	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	21	18.3	85	73.9	8	7.0	0	0.0	from the poorest
		KANELAND	3	1.9	27	17.3	113	72.4	12	7.7	1	0.6	neighborhood
12.	followers	ROCKFORD	2	1.8	19	16.8	56	49.6	34	30.1	2	1.8	
		KANELAND	5	3.2	47	30.5	65	42.2	32	20.8	5	3.2	leaders
13.	receive good grades	ROCKFORD	8	7.0	52	45.2	39	33.9	15	13.0	1	0.9	receive poor
		KANELAND	4	2.5	66	42.0	46	29.3	39	24.8	2	1.3	grades
14.	accepted	ROCKFORD	14	12.2	52	45.2	38	33.0	10	8.7	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	20	12.7	75	47.8	50	31.8	10	6.4	2	1.3	rejected
15.	inconsiderate *	ROCKFORD	2	1.7	4	3.5	57	49.6	43	37.4	9	7.8	
		KANELAND	4	2.5	24	15.3	59	37.6	53	33.8	17	10.8	polite
16.	kind	ROCKFORD	13	11.4	42	36.8	55	48.2	3	2.6	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	21	13.3	62	39.2	61	38.6	13	8.2	1	0.6	cruel

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE VIII(continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
17.	irresponsible	ROCKFORD	2	1.7	5	4.3	33	28.7	61	53.0	14	12.2	
		**KANELAND	1	0.6	29	18.5	49	31.2	54	34.4	24	15.3	responsible
18.	lazy	ROCKFORD	3	2.6	7	6.1	34	29.6	56	48.7	15	13.0	
		*KANELAND	7	4.5	27	17.3	47	30.1	56	35.9	19	12.2	ambitious
19.	insincere	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	2	1.8	43	37.7	53	46.5	15	13.2	
		*KANELAND	4	2.6	19	12.3	61	39.4	58	37.4	13	8.4	sincere
20.	respected	ROCKFORD	5	4.3	56	48.7	41	35.7	12	10.4	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	13	8.3	70	44.9	52	33.3	18	11.5	3	1.9	not respected
21.	involved	ROCKFORD	15	13.2	47	41.2	35	30.7	15	13.2	2	1.8	
		KANELAND	18	11.5	68	43.6	44	28.2	24	15.4	2	1.3	withdrawn
22.	dishonest	ROCKFORD	2	1.7	4	3.5	58	50.4	43	37.4	8	7.0	
		* KANELAND	3	1.9	21	13.5	62	40.0	48	31.0	21	13.5	honest
23.	dirty minded	ROCKFORD	8	7.0	11	9.6	64	55.7	28	24.3	4	3.5	
		* KANELAND	24	15.4	29	18.6	73	46.8	27	17.3	3	1.9	clean minded
24.	law abiding	ROCKFORD	6	5.3	40	35.1	48	42.1	17	14.9	3	2.6	
		KANELAND	9	5.8	51	32.7	69	44.2	20	12.8	7	4.5	crooked
25.	from professional families	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	8	7.0	55	47.8	40	34.8	11	9.6	from
		KANELAND	3	1.9	17	10.9	76	48.7	42	26.9	18	11.5	working class families
26.	poor readers	ROCKFORD	2	1.7	12	10.4	60	52.2	36	31.3	5	4.3	
		KANELAND	4	2.6	29	18.7	73	47.1	43	27.7	6	3.9	good readers

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE IX

A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO TAKE NO VOCATIONAL COURSES

(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

In general those students were perceived to be:

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1.	popular	ROCKFORD	16	13.9	47	40.9	43	37.4	7	6.1	2	1.7	
		KANELAND	18	11.9	73	52.3	46	30.5	6	4.0	2	1.3	unpopular
2.	* unfriendly	ROCKFORD	0	0.0	21	18.3	38	33.0	47	40.9	9	7.8	
		KANELAND	4	2.7	13	8.7	43	28.7	79	52.7	11	7.3	friendly
3.	uninteresting	ROCKFORD	2	1.8	18	15.8	42	36.8	44	38.6	8	7.0	
		KANELAND	4	2.6	15	9.9	49	32.5	74	49.0	9	6.0	interesting
4.	attractive	ROCKFORD	9	7.8	37	32.2	60	52.2	9	7.8	0	0.0	
		KANELAND	10	6.6	57	37.7	63	41.7	17	11.3	4	2.6	unattractive
5.	unintelligent	ROCKFORD	2	1.8	10	8.8	43	37.7	52	45.6	7	6.1	
		KANELAND	5	3.3	17	11.3	44	29.1	72	47.7	13	8.6	intelligent
6.	well groomed	ROCKFORD	11	9.6	37	32.2	54	47.0	12	10.4	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	12	8.0	57	38.0	55	36.7	21	14.0	5	3.3	unkempt
7.	wealthy	ROCKFORD	4	3.5	36	31.3	69	60.0	6	5.2	0	0.0	
		KANELAND	6	4.1	30	20.3	96	64.9	14	9.5	2	1.4	poor

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE IX (continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
		ROCKFORD	2	1.8	6	5.3	53	46.5	40	35.1	13	11.4	
8.	the out-group	KANELAND	4	2.7	13	8.7	64	43.0	54	36.2	14	9.4	the in-group
	troublesome	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	18	15.7	66	57.4	25	21.7	5	4.3	
9.	students	KANELAND	2	1.3	30	20.1	68	45.6	37	24.8	12	8.1	serious students
		ROCKFORD	5	4.3	40	34.8	58	50.4	11	9.6	1	0.9	
10.	smart	KANELAND	11	7.3	68	45.3	58	38.7	11	7.3	2	1.3	dumb
	from the best	ROCKFORD	4	3.5	26	22.6	75	65.2	10	8.7	0	0.0	from the poorest
11.	neighborhood	KANELAND	4	2.7	31	30.7	100	66.7	12	8.0	3	2.0	neighborhood
		ROCKFORD	2	1.8	28	24.8	53	46.9	26	23.0	4	3.5	
12.	followers	KANELAND	5	3.4	21	14.3	59	40.1	53	36.1	9	6.1	leaders
	receive good	ROCKFORD	5	4.3	42	36.5	47	40.9	20	17.4	1	0.9	receive poor
13.	grades	KANELAND	11	7.3	63	42.0	54	36.0	19	12.7	3	2.0	grades
		ROCKFORD	12	10.4	58	50.4	40	34.8	4	3.5	1	0.9	
14.	accepted	KANELAND	17	11.3	78	52.0	41	27.3	13	8.7	1	0.7	rejected
		ROCKFORD	2	1.7	14	12.2	51	44.3	42	36.5	6	5.2	
15.	inconsiderate	KANELAND	5	3.3	14	9.3	62	41.3	60	40.0	9	6.0	polite
		ROCKFORD	5	4.4	45	39.5	51	44.7	12	10.5	1	0.9	
16.	kind	KANELAND	14	9.4	64	43.0	56	37.6	12	8.1	3	2.0	cruel

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE IX (continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
		ROCKFORD	3	2.6	9	7.9	47	41.2	46	40.4	9	7.9	
17.	irresponsible	KANELAND	4	2.7	18	12.0	53	35.3	65	43.3	10	6.7	responsible
		ROCKFORD	3	2.6	18	15.8	50	43.9	40	35.1	3	2.6	
18.	lazy	KANELAND	4	2.7	25	16.8	54	36.2	54	36.2	12	8.1	ambitious
		ROCKFORD	1	0.9	14	12.2	55	47.8	41	35.7	4	3.5	
19.	insincere	KANELAND	5	3.3	19	12.7	63	42.0	53	35.3	10	6.7	sincere
		ROCKFORD	4	3.5	51	44.3	46	40.0	12	10.4	2	1.7	
20.	respected	KANELAND	13	8.7	79	53.0	42	28.2	13	8.7	2	1.3	not respected
		ROCKFORD	14	12.2	44	38.3	41	35.7	15	13.0	1	0.9	
21.	involved	KANELAND	22	14.9	75	50.7	39	26.4	10	6.8	2	1.4	withdrawn
		ROCKFORD	2	1.8	10	8.8	53	46.5	44	38.6	5	4.4	
22.	dishonest	KANELAND	4	2.7	10	6.8	65	44.2	58	39.5	10	6.8	honest
		ROCKFORD	10	8.7	15	13.0	65	56.5	22	19.1	3	2.6	
23.	dirty minded	KANELAND	17	11.6	19	13.0	83	56.8	23	15.8	4	2.7	clean minded
		ROCKFORD	8	7.0	33	28.7	55	47.8	16	13.9	3	2.6	
24.	law abiding	KANELAND	9	6.1	50	34.0	69	46.9	14	9.5	5	3.4	crooked
	from	ROCKFORD	5	4.3	23	20.0	67	58.3	17	14.8	3	2.6	from
25.	professional families	KANELAND	7	4.8	27	18.4	83	56.5	22	15.0	8	5.4	working class families
		ROCKFORD	1	0.9	7	6.1	62	54.4	39	34.2	5	4.4	
26.	poor readers	KANELAND	2	1.4	12	8.2	67	45.6	54	36.7	12	8.2	good readers

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE X

A REPORT AND COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS
FOR ROCKFORD AND KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS
WHO TAKE VOCATIONAL COURSES BUT DO NOT ATTEND AN AREA VOCATIONAL CENTER

(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

In general those students were perceived to be:

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1.	popular	ROCKFORD	11	9.6	48	41.7	47	40.9	8	7.0	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	14	9.5	65	44.2	62	42.2	5	3.4	1	0.7	unpopular
2.	unfriendly	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	7	6.1	33	28.9	61	53.5	12	10.5	
		KANELAND	0	0.0	7	4.8	52	35.4	74	50.3	14	9.5	friendly
3.	uninteresting *	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	4	3.5	41	36.0	50	50.9	10	8.8	
		KANELAND	0	0.0	18	12.2	65	44.2	51	34.7	13	8.8	interesting
4.	attractive	ROCKFORD	11	9.6	40	34.8	52	45.2	11	9.6	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	10	6.8	48	32.7	74	50.3	13	8.8	2	1.4	unattractive
5.	unintelligent *	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	7	6.1	45	39.5	53	46.5	8	7.0	
		KANELAND	0	0.0	27	18.4	55	32.4	56	38.1	9	6.1	intelligent
6.	well groomed	ROCKFORD	16	13.9	44	38.3	41	35.7	13	11.3	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	8	5.5	59	40.4	64	43.8	11	7.5	4	2.7	unkempt
7.	wealthy	ROCKFORD	3	2.6	27	23.7	74	64.9	9	7.9	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	3	2.1	24	16.4	103	70.5	15	10.3	1	0.7	poor

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE X (continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
8.	the out-group	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	9	7.9	61	53.5	35	30.7	8	7.0	
		KANELAND	2	1.4	18	12.4	80	55.2	37	25.5	8	5.5	the in-group
9.	troublesome students	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	13	11.3	56	48.7	33	28.7	12	10.4	
		KANELAND	1	0.7	24	16.4	75	51.4	40	27.4	6	4.1	serious students
10.	smart	ROCKFORD	8	7.0	50	43.5	43	37.4	13	11.3	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	8	5.5	50	34.2	65	44.5	22	15.1	1	0.7	dumb
11.	from the best neighborhood	ROCKFORD	2	1.7	27	23.5	74	64.3	11	9.6	1	0.9	from the poorest neighborhood
		KANELAND	4	2.8	17	11.8	111	77.1	10	6.9	2	1.4	
12.	followers	ROCKFORD	2	1.8	26	23.2	53	47.3	25	22.3	6	5.4	
		KANELAND	2	1.4	32	21.9	72	49.3	32	21.9	8	5.5	leaders
13.	receive good grades	ROCKFORD	9	7.8	41	35.7	46	40.0	19	16.5	0	0.0	
		KANELAND	7	4.8	59	40.4	57	39.0	21	14.4	2	1.4	receive poor grades
14.	accepted	ROCKFORD	14	12.2	53	46.1	33	28.7	14	12.2	1	0.9	
		KANELAND	16	11.0	66	45.5	50	34.5	10	6.9	3	2.1	rejected
15.	inconsiderate	ROCKFORD	1	0.9	9	7.8	45	39.1	50	43.5	10	8.7	
		KANELAND	3	2.1	15	10.3	65	44.5	53	36.3	10	6.8	polite
16.	kind	ROCKFORD	7	6.1	51	44.3	47	40.9	10	8.7	0	0.0	
		KANELAND	16	11.0	62	42.5	57	39.0	10	6.8	1	0.7	cruel

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
*** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE X (continued)
(SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEASUREMENT)

			very		somewhat		generally neither		somewhat		very		
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
		ROCKFORD	1	0.9	10	8.8	39	34.5	54	47.8	9	8.0	
17.	irresponsible	KANELAND	1	0.7	15	10.3	56	38.6	57	39.3	16	11.0	responsible
		ROCKFORD	1	0.9	10	8.8	38	33.6	50	44.2	14	12.4	
18.	lazy	KANELAND	2	1.4	24	16.6	60	41.4	44	30.3	15	10.3	ambitious
		ROCKFORD	0	0.0	6	5.2	42	36.5	56	48.7	11	9.6	
19.	insincere	* KANELAND	2	1.4	9	6.3	75	52.4	43	30.1	14	9.8	sincere
		ROCKFORD	10	8.8	54	47.4	37	32.5	12	10.5	1	0.9	
20.	respected	KANELAND	17	11.6	59	40.4	54	37.0	15	10.3	1	0.7	not respected
		ROCKFORD	14	12.3	52	45.6	35	30.7	11	9.6	2	1.8	
21.	involved	KANELAND	17	11.7	53	36.6	53	36.6	20	13.8	2	1.4	withdrawn
		ROCKFORD	1	0.9	9	7.9	56	49.1	39	34.2	9	7.9	
22.	dishonest	KANELAND	5	3.5	16	11.1	70	48.6	44	30.6	9	6.3	honest
		ROCKFORD	8	7.1	16	14.2	58	51.3	23	20.4	8	7.1	
23.	dirty minded	KANELAND	14	9.7	25	17.2	87	60.0	16	11.0	3	2.1	clean minded
		ROCKFORD	9	8.0	33	29.2	52	46.0	16	14.2	3	2.7	
24.	law abiding	KANELAND	10	6.9	44	30.3	72	49.7	13	9.0	6	4.1	crooked
	from	ROCKFORD	3	2.6	12	10.5	62	54.4	30	26.3	7	6.1	from
25.	professional	KANELAND	2	1.4	10	6.8	92	63.0	33	22.6	9	6.2	working class families
	families												
		ROCKFORD	3	2.6	12	10.5	52	45.6	36	31.6	11	9.6	
26.	poor readers	KANELAND	4	2.8	15	10.3	80	55.2	37	25.5	9	6.2	good readers

* X^2 significant at the .05 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .01 level of confidence
** X^2 significant at the .001 level of confidence

The absence of an asterisk indicates no statistically significant difference as determined by the X^2 test.

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF ROCKFORD AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE)

		Type	very		somewhat		neither		somewhat		very		generally	X^2
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
1.	popular	1	1	2.4	13	31.0	23	54.8	4	9.5	1	2.4	unpopular	
		2	0	0	6	30.0	12	60.0	1	5.0	1	5.0		
		3	3	5.8	14	26.9	26	50.0	9	17.3	0	0		N.S.
2.	unfriendly	1	2	4.8	4	9.5	13	31.0	16	31.1	7	16.7	friendly	
		2	0	0	0	0	6	30	10	50	4	20		
		3	1	1.9	7	13.5	18	34.6	20	38.5	6	11.5		N.S.
3.	uninteresting	1	1	2.4	5	11.9	12	28.6	19	45.2	5	11.9	interesting	
		2	1	5.0	2	10.0	10	50.0	7	35.0	0	0		
		3	2	3.8	6	11.5	21	40.4	18	34.6	5	9.6		N.S.
4.	attractive	1	3	7.1	14	33.3	20	47.6	3	7.1	2	4.8	unattractive	
		2	0	0	4	20.	14	70	2	10	0	0		
		3	1	2.0	17	34.0	26	52.0	3	6.0	3	6.0		N.S.
5.	unintelligent	1	1	2.4	5	11.9	10	23.8	19	45.2	7	16.7	intelligent	
		2	0	0	3	15.0	6	30.0	9	45.0	2	10.0		
		3	2	3.8	4	7.7	18	34.6	23	44.2	5	9.6		N.S.
6.	well groomed	1	6	14.3	16	38.1	14	33.3	6	14.3	0	0	unkempt	
		2	0	0	9	45	8	40	3	15	0	0		
		3	5	9.6	22	42.3	20	38.5	3	5.8	2	3.8		N.S.
7.	wealthy	1	0	0	6	14.3	32	76.2	4	9.5	0	0	poor	
		2	0	0	1	5.0	15	75	4	20	0	0		
		3	2	4.0	11	22.0	33	66.0	3	6.0	1	2.0		N.S.
8.	the out-group	1	1	2.4	5	11.9	23	54.8	11	26.2	2	4.8	the in-group	
		2	0	0	5	25	12	60	3	15	0	0		
		3	3	5.8	9	17.3	29	55.8	10	19.2	1	1.9		N.S.
9.	troublesome students	1	2	4.8	4	9.5	19	45.2	14	33.3	3	7.1	serious students	
		2	0	0	3	15	7	35	8	40	2	10		
		3	1	1.9	3	5.8	26	50	16	30.8	6	11.5		N.S.
10.	smart	1	3	9.3	18	43.9	19	46.3	1	2.4	0	0	dumb	
		2	2	10	5	25	11	55	2	10	0	0		
		3	2	3.8	18	34.6	28	53.8	2	3.8	2	3.8		N.S.
11.	from the best neighborhood	1	1	2.4	9	21.4	30	71.4	2	4.1	-	-	from the poorest neighborhood	
		2	0	0	3	15	14	70	3	15	-	-		
		3	0	0	9	17.3	40	76.9	3	5.8	-	-		N.S.
12.	followers	1	1	2.4	9	21.4	19	45.2	12	28.6	1	2.4	leaders	
		2	0	0	4	21.1	10	52.6	5	26.3	0	0		
		3	1	2.0	6	11.8	27	52.9	16	31.4	1	2.0		N.S.
13.	receive good grades	1	4	9.5	22	52.4	12	28.6	4	9.5	0	0	receive poor grades	
		2	1	5.0	7	35	8	40	4	20	0	0		
		3	3	5.8	23	44.2	18	34.6	7	13.5	1	1.9		N.S.

TABLE XI (continued)

	Type	very No.	%	somewhat No.	%	neither No.	%	somewhat No.	%	very No.	%	generally	X^2
14. accepted	1	5	11.9	20	47.6	12	28.6	5	11.9	0	0	rejected	
	2	3	15	9	45	7	35	1	5	0	0		
	3	6	11.5	23	44.2	18	34.6	4	7.7	1	1.9		N.S.
15. inconsiderate	1	0	0	2	4.8	18	42.9	20	47.6	2	4.8	polite	
	2	0	0	1	5.0	12	60	6	30	1	5.0		
	3	2	3.8	1	1.9	26	50	17	32.7	6	11.5		N.S.
16. kind	1	6	14.6	15	36.6	18	43.9	2	4.9	0	0	cruel	
	2	2	10.0	5	25.0	12	60	1	5.0	0	0		
	3	5	9.6	21	40.4	25	48.1	0	0	1	1.9		N.S.
17. irresponsible	1	1	2.4	2	4.8	12	28.6	22	52.4	5	11.9	responsible	
	2	0	0	2	10.0	6	30	10	50	2	10		
	3	1	1.9	1	1.9	15	28.8	28	53.8	7	13.5		N.S.
18. lazy	1	1	2.4	3	7.1	11	26.2	21	50	6	14.3	ambitious	
	2	1	5.0	1	5.0	8	40	10	50	0	0		
	3	1	1.9	3	5.8	15	28.8	24	46.2	9	17.3		N.S.
19. insincere	1	0	0	0	0	19	46.3	17	41.5	5	12.2	sincere	
	2	0	0	0	0	8	40	12	60	0	0		
	3	1	1.9	2	3.8	16	30.8	23	44.2	10	19.2		N.S.
20. respected	1	2	4.8	24	57.1	12	28.6	4	9.5	0	0	not respected	
	2	1	5.0	8	40	9	45	2	10	0	0		
	3	2	3.8	23	44.2	20	38.5	6	11.5	1	1.9		N.S.
21. involved	1	6	14.3	21	50	12	28.6	3	7.1	0	0	withdrawn	
	2	1	5.0	7	35	7	35	4	20	1	5.0		N.S.
	3	8	15.7	18	35.3	16	31.4	8	15.7	1	2.0		
22. dishonest	1	0	0	1	2.4	17	40.5	20	47.6	4	9.5	honest	
	2	0	0	1	5.0	15	75	4	20	0	0		
	3	2	3.8	2	3.8	26	50	18	34.6	4	7.7		N.S.
23. dirty minded	1	2	4.8	6	14.3	17	40.5	16	38.1	1	2.4	clean minded	
	2	1	5.0	1	5.0	14	70	3	15.	1	5.0		
	3	5	9.6	4	7.7	32	71.5	9	17.3	2	3.8		N.S.
24. law abiding	1	2	4.8	15	35.7	18	42.9	7	16.7	0	0	crooked	
	2	0	0	9	45	6	30	4	20	1	5		
	3	4	7.8	15	29.4	24	47.1	6	11.8	2	3.9		N.S.
25. from professional families	1	1	2.4	2	4.8	15	35.7	18	42.9	6	14.3	from working class families	
	2	0	0	2	10	13	65	2	10	3	15		
	3	0	0	4	7.7	27	51.9	19	36.5	2	3.8		N.S.
26. poor readers.	1	0	0	5	11.9	21	50	14	33.3	2	4.8	good readers	
	2	1	5	1	5	12	60	5	25	1	5		
	3	1	1.9	6	11.5	26	50	17	32.7	2	3.8		N.S.

TABLE XI (continued)

TABLE XII

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF KANELAND AREA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS CONCERNING SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PEERS WHO ATTEND AREA VOCATIONAL CENTERS BY TYPE OF STUDENT (SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE)

		Type	very No.	very %	somewhat No.	somewhat %	neither No.	neither %	somewhat No.	somewhat %	very No.	very %	generally	X^2
1.	popular	1	4	6.5	39	62.9	19	30.6	0	0	0	0	unpopular	
		2	0	0	23	39.7	27	46.6	7	12.1	1	1.7		
		3	0	0	19	52.8	13	36.1	4	11.1	0	0		.01
2.	unfriendly	1	2	3.2	4	6.5	9	14.5	28	45.2	19	30.6	friendly	
		2	2	3.4	2	3.4	26	44.1	27	45.8	2	3.4		
		3	4	11.4	6	17.1	8	22.9	17	48.6	0	0		.001
3.	uninteresting	1	4	6.5	7	11.3	10	16.1	26	41.9	15	24.2	interesting	
		2	1	1.7	9	15.3	28	47.5	19	32.2	2	3.4		
		3	1	2.8	5	13.9	13	36.1	17	47.2	0	0		.001
4.	attractive	1	6	9.8	24	39.3	26	42.6	5	8.2	0	0	unattractive	
		2	0	0	10	16.9	40	67.8	8	13.6	1	1.7		
		3	2	5.6	8	22.2	21	58.3	4	11.1	1	2.8		.05
5.	unintelligent	1	0	0	8	12.1	14	22.6	35	56.5	5	8.1	intelligent	
		2	1	1.7	14	24.1	33	56.9	10	17.2	0	0		
		3	1	2.9	11	31.4	7	20	15	42.9	1	2.9		.001
6.	well groomed	1	7	11.7	28	46.7	18	30	6	10	1	1.7	unkempt	
		2	0	0	11	18.6	28	47.5	18	30.5	2	3.4		
		3	1	2.8	15	41.7	13	36.1	7	19.4	0	0		.01
7.	wealthy	1	2	3.2	14	22.6	41	66.1	5	8.1	0	0	poor	
		2	0	0	3	5.1	44	7.4	11	18.6	1	1.7		
		3	1	2.9	10	28.6	18	51.4	5	14.3	1	2.9		.05
8.	the out-group	1	2	3.3	2	3.3	29	47.5	23	37.7	5	8.2	the in-group	
		2	2	3.4	10	16.9	40	67.8	7	11.9	0	0		
		3	4	11.1	6	16.7	17	47.2	8	22.2	1	2.8		.01
9.	troublesome students	1	3	4.8	11	17.7	22	35.5	21	33.9	5	8.1	serious students	
		2	2	3.4	17	28.8	28	47.5	12	20.3	0	0		
		3	0	0	4	11.4	16	45.7	14	40.0	1	2.9		N.S.
10.	smart	1	7	11.3	30	48.4	19	30.6	5	8.1	1	1.6	dumb	
		2	0	0	9	15.5	33	56.9	15	25.9	1	1.7		
		3	3	8.3	14	38.9	12	33.3	6	16.7	1	2.8		.001
11.	from the best neighborhood	1	2	3.3	12	19.7	45	73.8	2	3.3	0	0	from the poorest neighborhood	
		2	0	0	3	5.2	46	79.3	8	13.8	1	1.7		
		3	1	2.8	12	33.3	21	58.3	2	5.7	0	0		.05
12.	followers	1	1	1.6	14	23.0	19	31.1	24	39.3	3	4.9	leaders	
		2	3	5.3	23	40.4	26	45.6	5	8.8	0	0		
		3	1	2.9	10	28.6	19	54.3	3	8.6	2	5.7		.01
13.	receive good grades	1	2	3.2	34	54.8	16	25.8	10	16.1	0	0	receive poor grades	
		2	0	0	12	20.7	21	36.2	23	39.7	2	3.4		.01
		3	2	5.6	19	52.8	9	25.0	6	16.7	0	0		

TABLE XII (continued)

	Type	very generally No.	%	somewhat	%	neither	%	somewhat	%	very	%		X^2
14. accepted	1	13	21.	38	61.3	9	14.5	2	3.2	0	0	rejected	
	2	1	1.7	23	39.7	26	55.8	6	10.3	2	3.4		
	3	6	16.7	14	38.9	14	38.9	2	5.6	0	0		.001
15. inconsiderate	1	2	3.2	6	9.7	9	14.5	30	48.4	15	24.2	polite	
	2	1	1.7	13	22.4	33	56.9	10	17.2	1	1.7		
	3	1	2.8	5	13.9	17	47.2	12	33.3	1	2.8		.001
16. kind	1	18	29.0	28	45.2	15	24.2	1	1.6	0	0	cruel	
	2	1	1.7	15	25.4	34	57.6	8	13.6	1	1.7		
	3	2	5.6	18	50	12	33.3	4	11.1	0	0		.001
17. irresponsible	1	0	0	6	9.7	14	22.6	25	40.3	17	27.4	responsible	
	2	1	1.7	14	24.1	26	44.8	15	25.9	2	3.4		
	3	0	0	9	25	8	22.2	14	38.9	5	13.9		.01
18. lazy	1	2	3.2	7	11.3	10	16.1	29	46.8	14	22.6	ambitious	
	2	3	5.2	11	19.0	26	44.8	17	29.3	31	1.7		
	3	2	5.7	9	25.7	10	28.6	10	28.6	4	11.4		.01
19. insincere	1	1	1.7	6	10.0	13	21.7	28	46.7	12	20	sincere	
	2	2	3.4	10	17.2	32	55.2	14	24.1	0	0		
	3	1	2.8	3	8.3	15	41.7	16	44.4	1	2.8		.001
20. respected	1	10	16.4	34	55.7	14	23.0	1	1.6	2	3.3	not respected	
	2	1	1.7	14	24.1	28	48.3	14	24.1	1	1.7		
	3	2	5.6	21	58.3	10	27.8	3	8.3	0	0		.001
21. involved	1	12	19.7	35	57.4	10	16.4	4	6.6	0	0	withdrawn	
	2	1	1.7	14	24.1	27	46.6	14	24.1	2	3.4		
	3	5	13.9	18	50	7	19.4	6	16.7	0	0		.001
22. dishonest	1	1	1.7	5	8.3	12	20.0	26	43.3	16	26.7	honest	
	2	1	1.7	10	17.2	35	60.3	10	17.2	2	3.4		
	3	1	2.8	6	16.7	15	41.7	11	30.6	3	8.3		.001
23. dirty minded	1	13	21.3	12	19.7	19	31.1	14	23.0	3	4.9	clean minded	
	2	5	8.6	9	15.5	37	63.8	7	12.1	0	0		
	3	6	16.7	7	19.4	17	47.2	6	16.7	0	0		.05
24. law abiding	1	9	14.8	25	41.0	17	27.9	7	11.5	3	4.9	crooked	
	2	0	0	13	22.4	34	58.6	9	15.5	2	3.4		
	3	0	0	13	36.1	17	47.2	4	11.1	2	5.6		.01
25. from professional families	1	2	3.3	11	18.0	27	44.3	15	24.6	6	9.8	from working class families	
	2	0	0	1	1.7	34	58.6	16	27.6	7	12.1		
	3	1	2.8	5	13.9	14	38.9	11	30.6	5	13.9		N.S.
26. poor readers	1	2	3.3	8	13.3	17	28.3	29	48.3	4	6.7	good readers	
	2	2	3.4	17	29.3	33	56.9	5	8.1	1	1.7		.001
	3	0	0	4	11.1	23	63.9	8	22.2	1	2.8		

Interview Response Summary:

Twenty-seven high school students were interviewed individually. The length of each interview was from ten to fifteen minutes. Ten of the students were males and seventeen were females, while twenty-two were juniors and five were seniors. Sixteen of the interviewees were taking courses at an area vocational center, six had not taken any vocational courses, and five were taking vocational courses but not attending a vocational center. Twelve of the interviewees were from the Rockford area and fifteen were from the Kaneland area. The interviewees' generalized responses are summarized below:

1. Tell me about the high school students who live in this community. Do you know them well? In general terms, what are they like?

   Response: All interviewees stated that they knew the high school students in their community well and proceeded to describe them in general and in positive terms.

2. I would like for you to think of these students as being associated with certain groups and to tell me of any differences which you think exist between and among three specific groups:

   Group A - students who attend the area vocational center.
   Group B - students who take no vocational courses.
   Group C - students who take vocational courses but do not attend the area vocational center.

   Response: All interviewees indicated that they understood the grouping distinctions and knew students from each group. The interviewees then waited for specific questions.

TABLE XIII

INTERVIEWEE DESCRIPTION

(N=27)

SEX		HIGH SCHOOL GRADE LEVEL		COURSES TAKEN	
Male	10	Freshman	0	Attending area vocational center.	16
Female	17	Sophomore	0	Taking no vocational courses.	6
		Junior	22	Taking vocational courses, but not at the vocational area center.	5
		Senior	5		

3. Which of these groups do you think includes the largest number of students who are recognized as the active leaders in school? Which group includes the fewest number of this kind of student?

Response: Two-thirds of the interviewees reported Group B to include the largest number of this kind of student, while Groups A and C received equal mention for having the fewest number of this kind of student.

Specifically, which group, percentage-wise, has the most:

Question - 3.1 students who are leaders in the school?
Response - Group B (15); Group C (6); Group A (4).

Question - 3.2 popular students?
Response - Group B (11); Group A (5); Group C (4); mixed (4).

Question - 3.3 serious students?
Response - Group A (9); Group B (8); Group C (7).

Question - 3.4 outstanding scholars or "brains"?
Response - Group B (14); Group A (7); Group C (3).

Question - 3.5 respected or admired students?
Response - Group B (15); Group A (5); Group C (5).

Question - 3.6 students who are esteemed the highest by the faculty?
Response - Group B (9); Group C (8); Group A (7); mixed (3).

Question - 3.7 students who live in the best part of the community?
Response - Group B (11); Group C (4); Group A (4); mixed (6).

Question - 3.8 students who have parents who are wealthy?
Response - Group B (13); Group C (5); Group A (1); mixed (5).

Question - 3.9 students who have parents who are business or professional people?
Response - Group B (9); Group C (4); Group A (4); mixed (7).

Question - 3.10 students who probably will be the most successful as adults?
Response - Group A (12); Group B (7); Group C (5); mixed (3).

Question - 3.11 students with the potential to succeed in college?
Response - Group B (10); Group A (6); Group C (5); mixed (5).

Question - 3.12 students who are good at expressing themselves?
Response - Group B (11); Group C (6); Group A (3); mixed (6).

4. Which of these three groups includes the largest number of the students who are recognized as the least successful and least ambitious students in school? Which group includes the fewest number of this kind of student?

Response - Approximately one-third of the interviewees mentioned Group B to have the largest number of this kind of student, while Group A was mentioned one-third of the time as having the fewest number of this kind of student.

Specifically, which group, percentage-wise, has the most:

Question - 4.1 students who are lacking in leadership ability?
Response - Group A (11); Group B (8); Group C (3); mixed (4).

Question - 4.2 students who are "left out", "ignored", or "unpopular"?
Response - Group A (9); Group C (8); Group B (4); mixed (4).

Question - 4.3 students who are not interested in school?
Response - Group B (11); Group A (9); Group C (4); mixed (3).

Question - 4.4 poor achievers?
Response - Group B (13); Group A (6); Group C (3); mixed (3).

Question - 4.5 students who are unknown or rejected?
Response - Group B (11); Group A (6); Group C (4); mixed (4).

Question - 4.6 students who are regarded the least by the faculty?
Response - Group B (9); Group A (8); Group C (3); mixed (6).

Question - 4.7 students who live in the worst-poorest part of the community?
Response - Group B (9); Group A (7); Group C (5); mixed (6).

Question - 4.8 students who have parents who are poor?
Response - Group A (8); Group B (7); Group C (5); mixed (5).

Question - 4.9 students who have parents who are laborers?
Response - Group A (13); Group B (4); Group C (2); mixed (7).

Question - 4.10 students who probably will be the least successful as adults?
Response - Group C (9); Group B (9); Group A (4); mixed (5).

Question - 4.11 students who probably could not succeed in college?
Response - Group B (11); Group A (7); Group C (4); mixed (5).

Question - 4.12 students who are poor at expressing themselves?

Response - Group B (8); Group C (7); Group A (6); mixed (5).

5. Which of these three groups do you think most of the students in this community consider to have the highest social status:

Response - While responses were mixed, Group B was mentioned the most frequently.

Which two have the least?

Response - Groups A and C were mentioned about equally as the most frequent answers. Group B received several mentions, too.

6. Which of these three groups do you think most of the teachers in this community consider to have the highest social status?

Response - While responses were mixed, Group B was mentioned the most frequently.

Which two have the least?

Response - Groups A and C were mentioned about equally as the most frequent answers. Group B received several mentions, too.

7. Which of these three groups do you think most of the adults in the community consider to have the highest social status?

Response - While a definite pattern did not emerge in response to this question (all groups received nearly equal recognition), those students from rural and small town communities mentioned Group A as being considered by adults to have the highest social status.

Which two have the least?

Response - Group B was considered as having the lowest social status.

8. Which of these three groups do you consider to have the highest social status?

Response - Groups A and B shared about equally in the answers given to this question.

Which two have the least?

Response - Groups A and B shared about equally in the answers given to this question.

9. Does the social status according to these groups influence students to avoid or to become associated with any one of these three groups?

Response - A large majority of interviewees answered yes to this question.

If yes, which ones to avoid and which ones to associate with?

Response - Although no strong pattern of response was expressed, Group B was mentioned the most frequently as the Group students were influenced to become associated with. There was not a clear indication of the Group students were influenced to avoid; however, Groups A and B were mentioned more frequently than Group C.

10. Would other students whom you know rather well generally share the view you have expressed at this interview?

Response - Almost all of the interviewees answered yes to this question and agreed that their responses were representative of most of their friends' views.

Summary:

Almost all of the interviewees responded positively toward the interview. It would appear that these students do assign social status to their peers and to the groups with which they are associated; however, the importance attached to social status by these adolescents is not the same or as significant as that reported in the literature of the 1950's. Which is to say that the group to which one belongs would not appear to be less of a factor in determining social status and acceptance among these adolescents than it would twenty years ago. Another possibility is that students today reject the idea of stereotyping of individuals by group.

Although Group B, those students taking no vocational courses, included students with an extreme range of diversity (from the college bound to the psychological dropout), it generally was viewed as having the highest social status of the three groups. Of the three groups, it was reported to include most of the students who were leaders; popular; admired; outstanding scholars; residents of the "best" part of the community; children of wealthy, business and professional parents; possessive of the potential for success in college, and able to express themselves the best.

Group B was also perceived to be, of the three groups including the most; poor achievers, students who were not well known or interested in school, students who are regarded the least by faculty, who have the least potential for success in college.

Group A, those students taking vocational courses and attending an area vocational center, was mentioned with approximately the same

frequency as Group C as having the lowest social status of the three groups. Group A was reported to include most of the students who probably would be the most successful as adults.

Of the three groups, Group A was reported to include most of the students who were lacking in leadership ability, who are "left out" or "ignored" at school, and who have parents who are employed as laborers.

Group C, those students taking vocational courses but not attending a vocational center, included a range of student diversity that overlapped somewhat Groups A and B. When compared to the other groups, Group C was reported to have the least number of students who: lacked leadership ability, who were not interested in school, who were poor achievers, who were "unknown" and little regarded by the school's faculty, who have parents who are employed as laborers, and who would probably be least successful in college and as adults.

Of the three groups, the status accorded to the college bound segment of Group B appears to influence many students to desire to be associated with that Group more so than with either Groups A or C. The responses of interviewees left no clear indication of a pronounced desire on the part of many students to avoid any of the three groups.

Summary of Chapter II:

Student responses from the Rockford and Kaneland areas were presented in tabular form with comments relative to the significant differences in the responses. These TABLES (III through XII) yield data relative to the field testing of the Group Characteristics Questionnaire and the Semantic Differential. The interview responses were summarized and commented upon.

Evidence Bearing Upon Basic Question A.

A. Should planning of future area vocational centers be concerned with sociological viewpoints?

This question is recognized as a philosophical question and will of necessity, finally, be answered within a value structure. How much evidence do we have that students are aware of social status or group differences? In TABLE VII, in which all of the Questionnaire responses of students in the Kaneland area about area vocational students appear, is evidence that students are aware of certain differences. This TABLE and TABLE XII (Semantic Differential) indicate that different groups view one another differently in several dimensions or specific factors. The evidence further points to differences in this respect from one geographic area to another. (Compare TABLES VI and VII and TABLES XI and XII). Without further studies of community and demographic factors, speculation on the causes of such differences would be presumptious.

The student responses to the interviews convince the researchers that students are aware of groups and group differences. The student responses are also indicative of a belief in equality and a distaste for stereotyping of students by group. Nonetheless, the responses confirm that sociological status attaches to differing curricular groups.

In the review of related literature is an abundance of sources of comment from writers and researchers who perceive sociological differences in status among classes of people. Also, the writers in the field of adolescent psychology stress the importance of peer approval at the high school age level.

It is the considered judgment of the project director that in planning future area vocational centers, educators must be concerned with sociological viewpoints. This judgment is based upon: 1) Evidence that students do recognize sociological status, 2) Evidence that feelings for sociological status may vary from one community to another, 3) The belief that peer approval is necessary during the adolescent years, and 4) The belief that educators should encourage an open society in which all individuals are valued and respected.

Evidence Bearing Upon Basic Question B.

B. Are area vocational centers judged to be socially inferior to regular high schools?

This question was not approached in a direct manner, but rather by means of asking about the students who attend the centers. In many categories the students who attend area vocational centers ranked below others in factors to which status habitually attaches. An example of an item which is rather general in its implications is number ten on the Questionnaire (see TABLES III, IV, and V). This item has responses to "students are looked down upon." In the Rockford area 14.6% of the respondents said "yes." for area vocational school students. This percentage compares with 9.3% for students who take no vocational courses, and 7.3% for students who take vocational courses but at their high school. In the Kaneland area the percentages were smaller, but the area vocational students again were the least favored.

In item one on the Questionnaire (TABLES III, IV, and V) the responses

showed a heavy "no" for those who attend area vocational centers, compared with the other groups. This item deals with students who ". . . live in the best neighborhood."

The semantic differential (TABLES XI and XII) yielded interesting differences between the geographical regions of Kaneland and Rockford. None of the twenty-six items elicited significantly different responses from the three different student groups for the Rockford area (TABLE XI), but twenty-four of the twenty-six items in the Kaneland area showed significantly different responses (TABLE XII). All of the responses deal with students who attend area vocational centers. In many items the "Type 1" student (those attending the area vocational center) gave themselves much better marks than the other students gave them. For example, they saw themselves as much more popular, more friendly, more interesting, more attractive, etc., than their peers viewed them.

Numbers five and ten are intentionally quite similar items, but are reversed in left-to-right values in TABLE XII (unintelligent - intelligent, smart-dumb). Both items showed significance at the .001 level. All three groups showed reliability in switching from one side to the other, and again the vocational center students viewed themselves much more charitably than did the other groups.

Based upon the evidence from the Questionnaire, the Semantic Differential, and the Interview Guide, one would have to say that there is no clear-cut stigma or social inferiority feelings attaching to area vocational center students. The students, themselves, at the Kaneland area evidently believe themselves to be better than others perceive them. At Rockford there is no such evidence. The non-vocational students at the high school represent such a diverse group that both social superiority and

social inferiority might be ascribed to them.

A basic conclusion is that not all area vocational centers may be viewed in the same way. Populations, social expectancies, community values, and institutional reputation and effectiveness may all play roles in the perceptions people hold of an area vocational center.

Evidence Bearing Upon Basic Question C.

C. Can usable data be obtained on actual perception of area students by various peer groups?

Yes. The project director recommends three usable instruments from which choices may be made. In Chapter III are these instruments which have been refined by a jury, directors of vocational area centers, consultants, and by field testing.

They are the Group Characteristics Questionnaire, Semantic Differential: Perceived Characteristics of High School Students, and Interview Guide. Guides for their use are included.

Evidence Bearing Upon Basic Question D.

D. Do perceptions differ on separate area centers as compared to additional facilities at existing high schools?

Examination of TABLES V and X reveals little or no evidence to substantiate significant differences in the way students view students who take vocational courses at their own high schools. Neither do interviews reveal such differences. The project director concludes that within the scope of this study there was insufficient evidence of differing views to support any such contention. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence available, the answer is "no."

III. FIELD TEST RESULTS: RECOMMENDED INSTRUMENTS

Introduction

It was the intent of the project director to provide the potential user with a choice of recommended instruments for determining the perception of the sociological status of area vocational center students as reported by three categories of high school peers.

An interview guide, a semantic differential, a questionnaire and a check list were designed, developed, and field tested. Further revisions including the elimination of the check list were made as a result of the field test experience. The student responses to these instruments appear in Section II as a report of perceptions and as an example of how the user might analyze and present data obtained from the application of these instruments.

Following a discussion of the instrument assessment procedures and results, three instruments for obtaining a report of adolescent perceptions of their peers are recommended and presented.

Instrument Assessment Results

An "Instrument Assessment Report, Jury Form" (see Appendix A) was developed for use by three jurymen selected for their expertise in matters dealing with vocational education, adolescents, and/or research procedures. Three instruments--the Group Characteristics Questionnaire, the Semantic Differential, and the Group Characteristics Checklist--all in draft form were given to the jury members. Valuable insights and practical suggestions from these sources contributed to revisions of the instruments and modifications which undoubtedly added to their effectiveness. Input was also received from ten area vocational center directors.

Additions and deletions suggested by the jury were made, formats were modified, and wording of directions and items was changed. Not all suggestions were accepted, but all were carefully considered and decisions were made with appreciation of the expertise of the jurymen.

After administering each of the three instruments to students, an "Instrument Assessment Report, Student Form,"was given to these students(see Appendix B) for their immediate responses. In TABLE XIV are the tabulations of student responses. The students indicated little problem with understanding instructions or with words (Nos. one and three). One hundred eighty-two responses indicated that confusion was felt. However, sample comments were: "Too many questions", "Repeated themselves", "What is point?". The comments pointed not really to "confusion", but rather to objections to what we were asking them to do or to the repetition of items.

However, one response in ten (ninety-nine responses) was "yes" for item number four. The few comments about items that may have been neglected provided little help in interpreting this response. Some comments addressed themselves only to the difficulty of treating students in groups. In number five the question was about changes, and students made three hundred forty-two "yes" responses. Numerous comments were of a negative sort such as "What's the point?", "Asinine", "The whole thing?" (checklist). Others were more helpful such as "Too much importance on the wealth of parents". On the question of honesty in answering (number six), more than half the student responses were "yes". Most of the student comments on this item were similar:

TABLE XIV

COMPOSITE STUDENT ASSESSMENTS
OF THREE INSTRUMENTS

	yes	no	other
1. Did you have any trouble in understanding the instructions?	45	828	4
2. Did you find anything about these sheets confusing?	182	691	12
3. Were there any words that you didn't understand?	28	840	1
4. Was there anything which you would have liked to have said that was not mentioned on the instrument?	99	872	8
5. Was there anything on these sheets that you would leave out or change?	342	499	23
6. Do you think that students answered these items honestly?	429	263	117
7. Do you get the idea that these statements or questions are "against" some group of students?	395	528	123
8. Do these statements or questions make you picture some group of students as "bad" while another group is "good"?	320	523	18
9. Do you have suggestions for improvement of this instrument?	203	633	30

"Maybe", "Sometimes", "Mostly", and "Some don't know".

For numbers seven and eight some of the comments indicated that "there was prejudice in a way" or "all students are the same" or "you're trying to say that certain students are bad".

When (in number nine) suggestions for improvements were solicited, a great number of comments were made. Attention was called to repetitiveness of the three instruments. Very valuable contributions were made about sharpening some questions and eliminating at least two ambiguities. Students objected to "stereotyping" and some called attention to unsuited questions which didn't fit their school (minority groups). Two responses merely made the comment: "There stupid."(sic.)

After students had responded to the third instrument, they were asked to rate the three on a five through one basis (superior to poor). For all ratings, each instrument had a mean score between three and two, which was from "good" to "fair." The checklist (with 2.23) was rated lowest, but there were no great differences in student ratings among the three. Comparatively, few students rated any instrument as "superior."

The Group Characteristics Questionnaire

Discussion. On the following five pages is a recommended instrument for use in determining the perception of the sociological status of area vocational center students as reported by area vocational center students, non-area center vocational students, and non-vocational students of two types (college-preparatory and non-college-preparatory). This instrument was drafted, refined, field tested and finally re-designed. All items are positively stated so as to eliminate ambiguities, and a "don't know" column is retained so as to eliminate "forced choice" aspects.

Guide for Use. The following suggestions are made for the use of the Questionnaire with students.

A. Introduce yourself to the students and tell your purpose.
B. SAY..."There are directions on the first page, and I will go over them with you."
(Pass out the Questionnaire; have extra pencils.)
SAY..."Let's look at the first page."
(Under PART I - Reference Data, read the directions and have them check A, B, and C.)
A useful definition: "vocational classes." We usually mean advanced courses in business, industry and technology, and similar courses. Beginning typewriting, for example might not be considered as such a course. A vocational course could be thought of as one which might be of immediate use in a job when a student gets out of high school."
(Note of Caution--In different schools and classes teachers and others may not be in agreement with others as to what is a "vocational class.")
SAY..."Are there any questions?"
SAY..."Let's read the directions under PART II silently as I read them aloud." (Read directions.)
C. Wait twelve minutes (or until 90-95% of the students are finished and then SAY..."Take the next minute to finish."
After all have finished, pick up the questionnaires.

Data Analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Program may be used in analyzing the data. Tabular presentations may be made from computer printouts as are found in Section II of this report. It is recommended that in the computer analysis the "don't know" column be eliminated so as to use only respondents who feel they have some knowledge or opinion.

GROUP CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to obtain a report from students regarding the way that they see different groups of students in their school.

PART I - Reference Data

Directions: Please check the appropriate space for each item.

A. I am a:

_____freshman
_____sophomore
_____junior
_____senior

B. I am a:

_____male
_____female

C. I attend:

_____vocational classes at an area vocational center.
_____no vocational classes and am preparing for college.
_____no vocational classes and am not preparing for college.
_____vocational classes but do not go to the area vocational center

PART II - Student Report Data

Directions: Below and on the following pages are items to which you are asked to respond by placing a check (✓) mark in the space or column which most nearly indicates your agreement with each statement that follows the items. If you feel that the statement is generally accurate, place a check in the "yes" column; if sometimes accurate, place a check in the "sometimes" column; and if the statement is seldom or never accurate, place a check in the "no" column. If you aren't sure or don't know, place a check in the "don't know" column. Be sure to respond to all statements for each item. Proceed at your own pace until all items are completed.

(ITEMS AND STATEMENTS)	(RESPONSES)			
	yes	sometimes	no	don't know
A. Students who attend the area vocational center generally:				
1 ...live in the best neighborhood	____	____	____	____
2 ...have wealthy parents	____	____	____	____
3 ...do well in academic courses	____	____	____	____

(ITEMS AND STATEMENTS)	(RESPONSES) yes	sometimes	no	don't know
4 ...are involved in school activities	___	___	___	___
5 ...are popular and friendly	___	___	___	___
6 ...are leaders at school	___	___	___	___
7 ...will be very successful whey they finish school	___	___	___	___
8 ...will complete high school	___	___	___	___
9 ...mix well with most students	___	___	___	___
10 ...are "looked down upon"	___	___	___	___
11 ...have highly educated parents	___	___	___	___
12 ...use poor grammar	___	___	___	___
13 ...are the children of business and professional people	___	___	___	___
14 ...are ambitious to become successful	___	___	___	___
15 ...are held in high regard by many of the teachers	___	___	___	___
16 ...will go to college	___	___	___	___
17 ...tend to be from minority groups	___	___	___	___
18 ...will become adult leaders	___	___	___	___

B. Students who do not take vocational courses and are apparently preparing for college generally:	yes	sometimes	no	don't know
1 ...live in the best neighborhoods	___	___	___	___

	yes	sometimes	no	don't know
2 ...have wealthy parents	____	____	____	____
3 ...do well in academic courses	____	____	____	____
4 ...are involved in school activities	____	____	____	____
5 ...are popular and friendly	____	____	____	____
6 ...are leaders at school	____	____	____	____
7 ...will be very successful when they finish high school	____	____	____	____
8 ...will complete high school	____	____	____	____
9 ...mix well with most students	____	____	____	____
10 ...are "looked down upon"	____	____	____	____
11 ...have highly educated parents	____	____	____	____
12 ...use poor grammar	____	____	____	____
13 ...are the children of business and professional people	____	____	____	____
14 ...are ambitious to become successful	____	____	____	____
15 ...are held in high regard by many of the teachers	____	____	____	____
16 ...will go to college	____	____	____	____
17 ...tend to be from minority groups	____	____	____	____
18 ...will become adult leaders	____	____	____	____

C. Students who do not take vocational courses and apparently <u>are not</u> preparing for college generally:

	yes	sometimes	no	don't know
1 ...live in the best neighborhoods	____	____	____	____
2 ...have wealthy parents	____	____	____	____
3 ...do well in academic courses	____	____	____	____
4 ...are involved in school activities	____	____	____	____
5 ...are popular and friendly	____	____	____	____
6 ...are leaders at school	____	____	____	____
7 ...will be very successful when they finish high school	____	____	____	____
8 ...will complete high school	____	____	____	____
9 ...mix well with most students	____	____	____	____
10 ...are "looked down upon"	____	____	____	____
11 ...have highly educated parents	____	____	____	____
12 ...use poor grammar	____	____	____	____
13 ...are the children of business and professional people	____	____	____	____
14 ...are ambitious to become successful	____	____	____	____
15 ...are held in high regard by many of the teachers	____	____	____	____
16 ...will go to college	____	____	____	____
17 ...tend to be from minority groups	____	____	____	____
18 ...will become adult leaders	____	____	____	____

D. Students who take vocational courses at their high school generally:	yes	sometimes	no	don't know
1 ...live in the best neighborhoods	____	____	____	____
2 ...have wealthy parents	____	____	____	____
3 ...do well in academic courses	____	____	____	____
4 ...are involved in school activities	____	____	____	____
5 ...are popular and friendly	____	____	____	____
6 ...are leaders at school	____	____	____	____
7 ...will be very successful when they finish school	____	____	____	____
8 ...will complete high school	____	____	____	____
9 ...mix well with most students	____	____	____	____
10 ...are "looked down upon"	____	____	____	____
11 ...have highly educated parents	____	____	____	____
12 ...use poor grammar	____	____	____	____
13 ...are the children of business and professional people	____	____	____	____
14 ...are ambitious to become successful	____	____	____	____
15 ...are held in high regard by many of the teachers	____	____	____	____
16 ...will go to college	____	____	____	____
17 ...tend to be from minority groups	____	____	____	____
18 ...will become adult leaders	____	____	____	____

The Semantic Differential: Perceived Characteristics of High School Students

Discussion. On the following five pages is a recommended instrument for use in determining the perception of the sociological status of area vocational center students as reported by area vocational center students, non-area center vocational students and non-vocational students of two types, (college-preparatory and non-college-preparatory). This instrument was drafted, refined, and field tested before assuming its final form.

Guide for Use. The following suggestions are made for the use of the Semantic Differential with students.

A. Introduce yourself to the students and tell your purpose.
(Pass out the instrument.) (Have extra pencils.)

B. SAY..."Look at the top of the page. Read silently as I read aloud. The purpose of this check sheet...,etc." (Read through the directions.)

SAY..."Before you fill in the items at the bottom of the page, are there any questions?"

SAY..."Please check your sex and grade level. Let's see if we all know what a 'vocational course' is."

"We usually mean advanced courses in business, industry and technology, and similar courses. Beginning typewriting, for example might not be considered as such a course. A vocational course could be thought of as one which might be of immediate use in a job when a student gets out of high school."

(Note of Caution--Not everybody is in agreement about labeling "vocational subjects.")

SAY..."Turn the page and read the beginning statement at the top and check your answers. Make sure you read the statement at the top of each sheet because each page refers to a different group of students."

C. Wait twelve minutes (or until 90-95% of the students are finished and then SAY..."Take the next minute to finish."

After all students have finished, pick up the instruments.

Data Analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Program may be used in analyzing the data. Tabular presentations may be made from computer printouts as are found in Section II of this report. It is recommended that in the computer analysis the "don't know" column be eliminated so as to use only respondents who feel they have some knowledge or opinion.

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL:
PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Do not write your name on these sheets.

The purpose of this check sheet is to obtain your feelings about groups of high school students. On each of the following pages you will be asked to indicate how you feel about a particular group of students. Please place a check in the blank to indicate which word you think most accurately describes the individuals in that group of high school students.

DIRECTIONS: Here is how you are to use the check sheets. If you feel that the group of students named at the top of the page is clearly described by the word at one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

	very	:somewhat :	neither :	somewhat :	very	
FAIR	X	:	:	:	:	UNFAIR
FAIR		:	:	:	X	UNFAIR

In the first marking there is an indication that the group is very fair.
In the second marking there is an indication that the group is very unfair.

If you feel that the word at the end of the scale only somewhat describes this group of students you should place your check mark as follows:

	very	:somewhat :	neither :	somewhat :	very	
STRONG		: X :	:	:	:	WEAK
STRONG		:	:	: X :	:	WEAK

If you do not consider the group to be described by the word on either end of the scale, place your check mark in the middle space:

	very	:somewhat :	neither :	somewhat :	very	
SAFE		:	: X :	:	:	DANGEROUS

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check marks in the middle of the spaces!

: X : :X :
Like this. Not this!

(2) Be sure you make a check for every item.
(3) Never put more than one check mark on a single item.

Work at fairly high speed through this check sheet. Do not puzzle over individual words. Please do not be careless, but give your first impressions and your immediate feelings each time.

I am: (place a check for each of the three columns below)

(SEX)
_____a male
_____a female

(GRADE LEVEL)
_____a freshman
_____a sophomore
_____a junior
_____a senior

(CURRICULUM)
_____attending an area vocational center
_____not taking vocational courses and am preparing for college
_____not taking vocational courses and apparently am not preparing for college.
_____taking vocational courses at the high school only.

In general, the High School Students who attend the Area Vocational Center are:

	very	somewhat	generally neither	somewhat	very	
1. popular						unpopular
2. unfriendly						friendly
3. uninteresting						interesting
4. attractive						unattractive
5. unintelligent						intelligent
6. well groomed						unkempt
7. wealthy						poor
8. the out-group						the in-group
9. troublesome students						serious students
10. smart						dumb
11. from the best neighborhood						from the poorest neighborhood
12. followers						leaders
13. receive good grades						receive bad grades
14. accepted						rejected
15. inconsiderate						polite
16. kind						cruel
17. irresponsible						responsible
18. lazy						ambitious
19. insincere						sincere
20. respected						not respected
21. involved						withdrawn
22. dishonest						honest
23. dirty minded						clean minded
24. law abiding						crooked
25. from professional families						from working class families
26. poor readers						good readers

In general, the High School Students who do not take vocational courses and apparently are preparing for college are:

	very	somewhat	neither	somewhat	very	
1. popular						unpopular
2. unfriendly						friendly
3. uninteresting						interesting
4. attractive						unattractive
5. unintelligent						intelligent
6. well groomed						unkempt
7. wealthy						poor
8. the out-group						the in-group
9. troublesome students						serious students
10. smart						dumb
11. from the best neighborhood						from the poorest neighborhood
12. followers						leaders
13. receive good grades						receive bad grades
14. accepted						rejected
15. inconsiderate						polite
16. kind						cruel
17. irresponsible						responsible
18. lazy						ambitious
19. insincere						sincere
20. respected						not respected
21. involved						withdrawn
22. dishonest						honest
23. dirty minded						clean minded
24. law abiding						crooked
25. from professional families						from working class families
26. poor readers						good readers

In general, the High School Students who take no vocational courses and apparently are not preparing for college are:

	very	somewhat	neither	somewhat	very	
1. popular						unpopular
2. unfriendly						friendly
3. uninteresting						interesting
4. attractive						unattractive
5. unintelligent						intelligent
6. well groomed						unkempt
7. wealthy						poor
8. the out-group						the in-group
9. troublesome students						serious students
10. smart						dumb
11. from the best neighborhood						from the poorest neighborhood
12. followers						leaders
13. receive good grades						receive bad grades
14. accepted						rejected
15. inconsiderate						polite
16. kind						cruel
17. irresponsible						responsible
18. lazy						ambitious
19. insincere						sincere
20. respected						not respected
21. involved						withdrawn
22. dishonest						honest
23. dirty minded						clean minded
24. law abiding						crooked
25. from professional families						from working class families
26. poor readers						good readers

In general, the High School Students who take vocational courses at their high school are:

	very	somewhat	neither	somewhat	very	
1. popular						unpopular
2. unfriendly						friendly
3. uninteresting						interesting
4. attractive						unattractive
5. unintelligent						intelligent
6. well groomed						unkempt
7. wealthy						poor
8. the out-group						the in-group
9. troublesome students						serious students
10. smart						dumb
11. from the best neighborhood						from the poorest neighborhood
12. followers						leaders
13. receive good grades						receive bad grades
14. accepted						rejected
15. inconsiderate						polite
16. kind						cruel
17. irresponsible						responsible
18. lazy						ambitious
19. insincere						sincere
20. respected						not respected
21. involved						withdrawn
22. dishonest						honest
23. dirty minded						clean minded
24. law abiding						crooked
25. from professional families						from working class families
26. poor readers						good readers

The Interview Guide

Discussion. On the following five pages is a recommended instrument for use in determining the perception of the sociological status of area vocational center students as reported by themselves, non-area center vocational students, and non-vocational students of two types, college-preparatory and non-college-preparatory. This instrument was drafted, refined, and field tested before it assumed this final form.

Guide for Use. It is essential that: (1) The interviewer is skillful in interviewing high-school-age students; (2) A quiet, semi-private area be used; (3) Rapport be established between interviewer and interviewee. The following suggestions are made:

A. Establish rapport.

B. Read the directions aloud to the student.

C. Collect reference information and talk about "vocational courses" to satisfy yourself that the student understands the term.

D. Proceed with the interview taking only necessary notes.

Data Analysis. These data do not lend themselves readily to statistical analyses, so it is recommended that they be noted, summarized and analyzed in the manner of the data in Section II of this report under "Interview Response Summary."

A STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR PEERS

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Directions: This interview is part of a study to determine some of the ways that students think of each other. You will be asked some questions about the way you feel and how you see other students; especially when these students are considered to be in one of four groups. Please say just the way you really feel; the only "right" answers are what you really think. You will not be identified by name, but will be classified by grade level, sex, and courses taken. The interview will take about ten or fifteen minutes. The interviewer will need to take notes during the interview.

I. Interviewee Reference Information:

Sex:	Grade Level:	Courses:
_____Male	_____Freshman	_____Attending area vocational center
_____Female	_____Sophomore	_____Taking no vocational courses and apparently preparing for college
	_____Junior	_____Taking no vocational courses but apparently not preparing for college
	_____Senior	_____Taking vocational courses but not at the area vocational center

II. Interview Responses:

1. Tell me about the high school students who live in this community. Do you know them well? In general terms, what are they like?

2. I would like for you to think of these students as being associated with certain groups and to tell me of any differences which you think exist between and among four specific groups:

   Group A - students who attend the area vocational center.
   Group B - students who take no vocational courses and who apparently are preparing for college.
   Group C - students who take no vocational courses and who apparently are not preparing for college.

Group D - students who take vocational courses but do not attend the area vocational center.

Do you have these four groups in mind? (Repeat the four, if necessary.)

3. Which of these groups do you think includes most of the students who are recognized as the active leaders in school? Which group includes the least of this kind of students?

Response -

(the most)

(the least)

Specifically, which group, percentage-wise, has the most:

Question - 3.1 students who are leaders in school?
Response -

Question - 3.2 popular students?
Response -

Question - 3.3 serious students?
Response -

Question - 3.4 outstanding scholars or "brains"?
Response -

Question - 3.5 members who are esteemed the highest by students?
Response -

Question - 3.6 students who live in the best part of the community?
Response -

Question - 3.7 students who have parents who are wealthy?
Response -

Question - 3.8 students who have parents who are business or professional people?
Response -

Question - 3.9 students who probably will be the most successful as adults?
Response -

Question - 3.10 students with the potential to succeed in college?

Response -

Question - 3.11 students who are good at expressing themselves?
Response -

4. In which of these four groups are most of the students who are recognized as the least successful and least ambitious students in school? In which group do you find the least of this kind of student?

   Response -

   (the most)

   (the least)

Specifically, which group, percentage-wise, has the most:

Question - 4.1 students who are lacking in leadership ability?
Response -

Question - 4.2 students who are "left out", "ignored", or "unpopular"?

Response -

Question - 4.3 students who are not interested in school?
Response -

Question - 4.4 poor achievers?
Response -

Question - 4.5 members who are regarded the least by students?
Response -

Question - 4.6 students who live in the worst-poorest part of the community?

Response -

Question - 4.7 students who have parents who are poor?
Response -

Question - 4.8 students who have parents who are laborers?
Response -

Question - 4.9 students who probably will be the least successful as adults?

Response -

Question - 4.10 students who probably could not succeed in college?
Response -

Question - 4.11 students who are poor at expressing themselves?
Response -

5. Which of these four grups do you think most of the students in this community consider to have the highest social status?

Response -

5.1-Which one has the least?

Response -

6. Which of these four groups do you think most of the teachers in this community consider to have the highest social status?

Response -

6.1-Which one has the least?

Response -

7. Which of these four groups do you think most of the adults in the community consider to have the highest social status?

Response -

7.1-Which one has the least?

Response -

8. Which of these four groups do you consider to have the highest social status?

Response -

8.1-Which one has the least?

Response -

9. Does the social status of these groups influence students to avoid or to become associated with any one of them?
Response -

9.1-If yes, which would be avoided and which ones associated with?

Response -

10. Would other students whom you know rather well generally share the view you have expressed in this interview?

Response -

Summary

Section III has presented the results of the instrument assessments by a jury, vocational center directors, and students in the Rockford and Kaneland areas. After field testing, two pencil-and-paper instruments and an interview guide were improved upon and retained and one pencil-and-paper checklist was discarded.

These three instruments - Group Characteristic Questionnaire, Semantic Differential, and Interview Guide - are each presented here in final form with a discussion and Guide for Use.

IV. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The problem of the study was to find what perceptions three classifications of adolescent student peers report about the sociological status of area vocational center students in Illinois. The purpose of the study was to design, develop, field test, and recommend survey instruments and procedures for determining these perceptions. Additionally the study was addressed to four basic questions.

Following a review of related literature, instruments were drafted and three surveys were conducted to obtain input, criticisms, and reactions from: (a) a jury of professional educators with expertise in vocational education and educational measurement; (b) directors of area vocational centers in Illinois; and (c) high school juniors and seniors in districts served by the Rockford and Mid-Valley (Kaneland) Area Vocational Centers. Data from the surveys were used in the further development of the instruments and procedures.

In Section II, the field test results of the Group Characteristics Questionnaire, the Semantic Differential, and the Interview Guide were presented and discussed. Answers were offered for the four basic questions.

In Section III, the three recommended instruments are presented after a discussion of the instrument assessment results. Each instrument is accompanied by a brief discussion and a guide for use.

Conclusions

Sociological status may attach to different curricular groups. Therefore, planning officers and educators should be concerned with sociological viewpoints and their ramifications when planning future area vocational centers. Not all populations respond in the same ways to status of groups, so each area or community requires special scrutiny (see page 45).

There is no clear-cut evidence that stigma or social inferiority attaches to students at area vocational centers. It may be that some non-vocational students such as psychological drop-outs enjoy less prestige and regard than any others in high school. There is some evidence that the college-preparatory student is held in higher regard than others.

It is possible for area center vocational students to have a high opinion of themselves. This high opinion may not be held to the same degree among other students (see page 47).

Usable data can be obtained on perceptions of student groups by their peers. Pencil-and-paper instruments and interview techniques represent ways of obtaining such data.

Evidence does not support a belief that perceptions of sociological status differ between students attending an area vocational center and students taking vocational courses at their high school.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the three instruments presented in Section III be considered as usable for obtaining data on peer

group perceptions of sociological status of student groups.

It is recommended that further field testing be done with these instruments particularly since differing results were obtained at two geographically separated school districts.

It is recommended that in conjunction with the use of these instruments in a school district that the community served should be analyzed for demographic, economic, and social characteristics.

It is recommended that planners consider all implications of social stratification in planning vocational facilities.

It is recommended that data from the Questionnaire and the Semantic Differential be processed by computer and analyzed from tabulations. The interview technique should be accepted as a carefully controlled, but subjective, instrument which may yield in-depth data which might be missed by more objective techniques.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bernard, J. "Socio Economic Class and the School Counselor," Theory into Practice, 2:17-23, 1963.

Bhushan, V. "Comparison of I.Q. and Socioeconomic Index in Predicting Grade Point Average," Education, 90:167-169, 1969.

Brookover, Wilbur B., E. L. Erickson, and L. M. Joiner. "Educational Aspirations and Educational Plans in Relation to Academic and Socio-economic Status," School Review, 75:392-400, 1967.

_____, and S. Nasow. "A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States," ERIC, Ed 025 615, 1969.

Byram, H. "Evaluation Systems for Local Programs of Vocational-Technical Education. Final Report," ERIC, Ed 029 999, 1968.

Cole, L. and I. Hall. Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Coleman, Herbert A. "The Relationship of Socioeconomic Status to the Performance of Junior High School Students," Journal of Experimental Education, 9:61-63, 1940.

Coleman, James. The Adolescent Society. Glenco, Illinois: The Free Press of Glenco, 1962.

Corplan Associates. "Survey of Information on Vocational and Technical Education in the State of Illinois. Final Report," ERIC, Ed 018 567, 1966.

Curry, Robert J. "Certain Characteristics of Under-achievers and Over-achievers," Peabody Journal of Education, 39:41-45, 1961.

Eddy, L. "Meeting the Challenge for Technical Education at the High School Level," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 52:18-19, 1963.

Empey, L. "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, 21:703-709, 1956.

Evans, R., G. Mangum, and O. Pragan. Education for Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1969.

Farrier, S. "The Educational and Vocational Interests, Attitudes, and Aspirations of Rural Youth and Their Parents," Dissertation Abstracts, 29:2517, 1969.

Forslund, M., and L. Malry. "Social Class and Relative Level of Occupational Aspiration: Implications for Deliquency and Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 54:106-115, 1970.

Garrison, K. Psychology of Adolescence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Havighurst, R. J., and H. G. Morgan. The Social History of a War-Boom Community. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951.

_____, and B. L. Neugarten. Society and Education. Third edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.

Jensen, P., and W. Kirchner. "A National Answer to the Question: Do Sons Follow Their Fathers' Occupations?" Journal of Applied Psychology, 39:419-421, 1955.

Jersild, A. The Psychology of Adolescence. Second edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1963.

Journal, Association for the Study of Perception, Volumes I through VII, 1966-1972.

Kahl, J. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23:186-203, 1953.

Kraft, R. "Cost Effectiveness Analysis of Vocational-Technical Education Programs. A Pilot Study. Final Report," ERIC, Ed 034 055, 1969.

Lavin, D. The Prediction of Academic Performance. New York: Russess Sage Foundation, 1965.

Law, Gordon. "Area School: Getting the Most for the Educational Dollar," School Shop, 23:57-60, 1964.

McCandless, B. and E. Evans. Children and Youth: Psychosocial Development. Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press, 1973.

McDonald, K. "Relationship of Socioeconomic Status to an Objective Measure of Motivation," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 42:997-1002, 1964.

Mouly, George J. Psychology for Effective Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Nerden, J. "Statewide Evaluation of Vocational Education," Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education: First Yearbook of the American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.: American Vocational Association, 1971.

O'Neal, W. M. "Basic Issues in Perceptual Theory," Psychological Review, Vol. 65, No. 6, 1958.

Powell, M. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Rosen, B. "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21: 203-211, 1956.

Russo, M. "The What and Why of the Area Vocational School, Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 54:28-32, 1965.

Schriver, W., and R. Bowley. "The Effect of Vocational Training on Labor Force Experience. An Analysis of the Tennessee Area Vocational-Technical School System," ERIC, ED 051 388, 1971.

Shertzer, B., and C. Stone. Fundamentals of Guidance. Second edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

Stone, L., and J. Church. Childhood and Adolescence. Second edition. New York: Random House, 1968.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education for a Changing World of Work, Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, 1963.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Labor Statistics. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Von Stroh, G. "A Socio-Economic Study of Vocational- Technical Education Students," ERIC, ED 047 122, 1968.

Warren, M. "Generalizations Related to Concepts Important for Youth Orientation to the World of Work," ERIC, ED 029 998, 1967.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT
(Jury Form)

CONSULTANT _____ DATE _____

NAME OF INSTRUMENT _____

Consultant remarks concerning:

Form:

Items:

Appropriateness:

Completeness:

Clarity

Wording:

Deletions:

Additions:

Probable validity/reliability:

Remarks and other suggestions for improvement (use back side if needed):

Please return this form by _____ to _____.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT ASSESSMENT REPORT
(Student Form)

Name of Instrument_____

Please answer each question and comment if you wish to do so in the space provided for comments.

	yes	no	other	Student comments (use back if needed)
1. Did you have any trouble in understanding the instructions?				
2. Did you find anything about these sheets confusing?				
3. Were there any words that you didn't understand?				
4. Was there anything which you would have liked to have said that was not mentioned on the instrument?				
5. Was there anything on these sheets that you would leave out or change?				
6. Do you think that students answer these items honestly?				
7. Do you get the idea that these statements or questions are "against" some group of students?				
8. Do these statements or questions make you picture some group of students as "bad" while another group is "good?"				
9. Do you have suggestions for improvement of this instrument?				

Please rank the three instruments that you have just responded to from high to lowest on the basis of how effective you consider them to be in getting you to describe any difference in the three groups mentioned.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Semantic Differential					
Questionnaire					
Characteristics Check List					